

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

MAY, 1838.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ART. I.—*Discourses by the late Rev. JOHN B. PATTERSON, A.M. Minister of Falkirk; to which is prefixed a Memoir of his Life, and select literary and religious Remains. With a Portrait of the Author.* Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1837. 2 Vols. 8vo. pp. vii. 464; viii. 438.

We do not think, except under very particular circumstances, that the modern fashion of publishing the life and remains of every second-rate actor on the stage of life, is either judicious on the part of surviving friends, or beneficial to the public interest. We are, indeed, quite sure that the departed, if endowed with that humility which is thus ostentatiously paraded, and that dignified but retiring character thus held up to public approbation, would shrink from being made a stalking-horse, under whose shadow particular opinions may be hazarded; would deprecate the affectionate but indiscreet zeal, which makes their efficient, but certainly by no means uncommon, discharge of religious obligations a theme of inflated eulogy, or sickening flattery.

It cannot, at the same time, fail to strike the thinking portion of the public most forcibly, that these peculiarly brilliant meteors of the religious system revolve exclusively in the orbit of dissent. There alone are played—

“Such fantastic tricks before high heaven,
As make the angels weep.”

It must not be supposed, from these remarks, that the volumes before us have *no* merit. On the contrary, we are quite willing to concede to Mr. Patterson, all he ever arrogated to himself; but certainly think

his own estimate of his abilities, both as a scholar and divine, more accurate than that of his biographer; for instance,—

He used to allege, that a degree of heaviness and labour was visible in all his compositions, and that, even in his most rapidly composed popular addresses, he never could shake off the appearance of something operose about his style. And indeed we have sometimes thought that had he retouched and elaborated less, he would, as far as the pulpit was concerned, have gained more in force than he would have lost by the absence of that polished balance of sentences which fills the ear almost to satiety. We should also have liked a little more familiar and idiomatic English. Here and there too we may detect a Latinism, or some phrase or form of speech classical in itself, but startling to the mere English reader; sometimes also there is a richness rather than sweetness,—a brilliancy protracted till it becomes fatiguing,—in his diction.—Vol. i. p. 232.

And previously, it was said;—

We have indeed heard him charged with an elaborate and artificial style of preaching,—a manner too rhetorical and declamatory; but the objection never appeared to us well founded. It seemed the criticism of superficial observers, who mistook the majestic march of his language, and the natural magnificence of his thoughts, for the mere love of glitter and pomp, and an ear for flowing phrases and balanced periods. Such objectors seemed to us to confound the impulses of a powerful and capacious mind dealing with the stupendous revelations of the Gospel, and a loftiness of language flowing from the very subject-matter of his thoughts, for an empty and frivolous parade of words, and a straining after effect. Nor did they sufficiently advert to the fact that his rich and gorgeous imagination drew much of its conceptions and imagery from the beautiful and the sublime of Scripture. In a word, they perceived not that he was “a popular philosopher, and a philosophical declaimer.” His discourses were neither abstract nor scholastic; he did not deal in metaphysical subtleties and recondite speculations, but addressed himself to the common sympathies and understanding of his hearers. His sermons were characterised by clearness as well as depth of thought; by precision and vigour of expression, not less than by rich diction and flowing eloquence; by lucid arrangement, and by the grace and finish of the whole.—Vol. i. pp. 229, 230.

Such is the panegyric of his biographer; and sorry are we to say, that, after a careful perusal of the volume, we are compelled to pronounce it, as far as the style of the sermons goes, totally unmerited: the fact is, *heaviness and labour* are the striking characteristics of his pulpit discourses, and every page betrays the *appearance of something operose*, of which, by the first extract, the author himself was perfectly conscious.

Nor are we singular in our opinions; for, at page 252, we are more than once told, that “his popularity was not equal to his real merits:” which implies merely, that his too partial friend was dissatisfied with the verdict pronounced by the public at large, on the talents and acquirements of Mr. Patterson. Of the juvenile correspondence, and school exercises, little advantageous can be said; we have seen many far better, which judicious friends never thought of obtruding beyond the privacy of the domestic circle. Good, certainly, of their respective

kind, and gratifying to the eyes of kindred love; but of no more interest to the public than an old catalogue, or a broken toy.

We heartily wish we could speak with equal indulgence of some portion of the correspondence written at a maturer age, and when, if the biographer's estimate of his abilities and good sense were just, sounder opinions and more enlightened views would have prevailed. In the year 1828, it appears he proceeded to Oxford as tutor to Lord Cranstoun, and acknowledges that his reception was far more gratifying and liberal than he expected; that the head of the college called upon him, and invited him to his house; and that, although totally unconnected, in an academical point of view, with the University, all the treasures of the Bodleian and other great libraries and museums were freely open to his inspection. And how is this requited by the Edinburgh graduate? Read his own account:—

He talked with great candour and liberality of the London University. The King's College he styles—happily enough—a mean plagiarism of another man's idea. I find, in general, that the King's College is much more unpopular in Oxford than the London University, though the Oxonians,—as the title of “King's” rendered necessary I suppose,—subscribed for the former and not for the latter. I called on the Dean of Christ Church at his own desire, and was very politely treated. Mr. C—— tells me, that when he first proposed my residing here, his reverence was afraid that the ruin of the University might be the consequence of such an innovation; and his right-hand man —, the censor of the college, touched upon the dangers of an “imperium in imperio.” On Mr. C——'s giving his pledge, however, for my peaceable behaviour, they dismissed their terrors, and have both been very polite to me. I have dined twice at the public table of the college, or, according to the elegant academic phrase, “eaten my commons in hall.” I was somewhat surprised and pleased to find so much more liberality of sentiment in the common-room of Christ Church than I had expected. The last petition from Oxford on the Catholic question, showed the growth of right feeling even within these monkish precincts; and, from what I see, those who still professedly adhere to the old system, are less willing than of old to proclaim their opinions and act the challengers in the fray.—Vol. i. pp. 186, 187.

And again,—

“To say the truth, the Oxonian system, viewed merely as a process of instruction, abstractedly from its endowments and means of learned leisure, is,—as the world is beginning to find out—most wofully deficient; and that both in respect of the matter and of the manner of education. In regard to the former point, there are absolutely not the means in Oxford of a complete and liberal education, even for those who are inclined to make use of them: the only branch of study for which there are at all adequate appliances provided being the classical department. And even in this department the celebrity of Oxford does not seem to me to depend on the mode of instruction taken by itself, but on the inducements held out, in the way of honours and rewards, to proficiency in the first instance; and then to the establishments it possesses for the support of a great number of individuals whose profession is literature, and among whom it were strange if one or two should not be found who became enthusiasts in their profession, and, having nothing else in the world to attend to, really profound and erudite scholars. This seems to me the true secret of Oxonian erudition; not that as a body the men brought up at Oxford

are more learned, far less better informed, than the men educated at Edinburgh,—but that Oxford does not, like Edinburgh, let her scholars go just at the moment when they have got over the preliminaries, when they have got the command of their tools, and might, if they were not called away to active service in life, begin to explore the arcana, and become initiated into the greater mysteries. Put up a hundred or two rich sinecures in Edinburgh for learned men, as such, and out of the hundred you will certainly find one or two in a generation who will turn these sinecures to their intended use,—the undisturbed cultivation of the pursuits of erudition. Whether the gain be worthy of the price is another question; but that is the way, if you wish it, to turn Edinburgh into an Oxford.”—Vol. i. pp. 210, 211.

We do not make these extracts with the view of defending Oxford against such utter trash as Mr. Patterson thought proper to write, and his congenial friend has deemed it wise to publish; but we wish to show the gratitude by which both were actuated; and the kindly and liberal feelings entertained by the philosophers of modern Athens towards the Christians of Oxford. For it must be borne in mind, that the author and publisher of the above passages was not looked upon as a *novus homo*, but as “highly gifted”—as “fitted to instruct and improve, as well as adorn society”—as possessing “talents likely to be exerted with the greatest utility to society, and, humanly speaking, with the greatest advantage to the Church of Christ”—and his death is called the “passing away of a glory from the earth.”

We have now, we believe, said quite enough to justify the opening sentences of this brief review: if, however, the subject were worth pursuing, we could extract numberless passages breathing any thing but that—

“Soft, meek, patient, humble, tranquil spirit,”

so loudly trumpeted forth by the publisher. He was, however, a general *Reformer*, and did not at all wish to confine the pruning-knife to Oxford. Writing to a friend, he says,—

“I wish to devote my ecclesiastical life to the reformation of the Church; and especially to oppose and do what I may to subvert the grand corruption of the Establishment—the pretended necessity of the Church’s giving effect to every legal presentation, irrespective of the probabilities of edification in each particular case. The church-courts have already begun to break down the moderate system, in this respect, by their decision in the ever-memorable case of Little Dunkeld; and I hope to see the day when the principle of the system and its practice shall be uprooted together.” . . . “I don’t know any thing that would probably be more useful to the Church than a good stiff breeze of peril, which would oblige it to set the vessel all to rights,—to get rid of useless encumbrances, and make all the crew feel that the Church of Scotland expects every man to do his duty.”—Vol. i. pp. 254, 255.

Ohe! jam satis. We shall leave our readers to draw their own conclusions with respect to Mr. Patterson and his biographer from the extracts given above; previously deprecating the interpretation of 1 Tim. iii. 1—7, in which he would substitute *Elder* for *Bishop*, because

"in the New Testament these appellations have the same meaning," and thus convert the Scottish Presbytery into a bench of Bishops. Nor must we forget to congratulate the High School of Edinburgh, inasmuch as, despite Mr. Patterson's avowed predilection for University College, London, where the Gospel is excluded, they persist in "devoting an additional hour every Monday morning to the Greek Testament."

ART. II.—*Vérité Catholique, ou Vue générale de la Religion considérée dans son Histoire et dans sa Doctrine.* Par M. A. NAULT, Ancien Procureur-Général. Bruxelles, 1838. 12mo. pp. 176.

For a Roman Catholic, and more particularly for a Roman-catholic layman, to write on the evidences of Christianity, must surely be a task of no ordinary embarrassment. We have here a little manual, which, with the exception of some half-dozen pages, in which the Papal errors are more prominently displayed, we should gladly place in the hands of a *Protestant*; but with what kind of consistency it can be sent forth, with all the formality of an *imprimatur* from the Vicar-General of the diocese of Malines, it is somewhat difficult to conceive. The book is really a good one; the external and internal evidences are developed in a clear, concise, and convincing epitome; and it is only when the author feels himself in duty bound to say a good word for the infallibility of the church, and a bad one against the "grand schism of the sixteenth century," that a weak cause is upheld with a weak argument, or rather with no argument at all. Now it is well known that Belgium is the stronghold of the Papacy; that the ignorance of the lower classes, the intolerance of the higher, and the tyranny of the priesthood, is about on a par with the state of things in Ireland; and that the interdiction of the Scriptures is absolute and peremptory. How is it then that M. Nault can ask of his readers, with reference to the intrinsic excellencies of Christianity, "Qui contestera aujourd'hui que ces caractères ne conviennent qu'à la Bible?" (P. 24.) Allowing him, however, to ask the question, how is it possible that persons to whom the Bible is a sealed book, should be competent either to admit the point, or dispute it? It is true that a certain number of authorities are given in the foot-notes, and some texts even quoted at large from the *Latin Vulgate*; but here again we ask, *cui bono*? since his readers are not at liberty to verify the one, and cannot understand the other. Above all, what business has M. Nault himself, as a *layman*, to be prying into these hidden mysteries; and with positive heresy, according to his own creed, to tell his readers to do likewise? "*Ouvrez le Testament nouveau: il*

n'est pas une parole du livre des Chrétiens qui ne tende à approfondir cette double science, source de toute lumière, et fondement de toute morale." (P. 83.) *Open the New Testament!!* Doubtless the "Book of Christians, the source of all light, and the foundation of all morality," will not avail much except it be opened; but surely the injunction is neither more nor less than rank heresy in the mouth of a Roman-catholic layman. Indeed we have but to turn over a few pages, in order to convict the writer out of his own book. "En tractant ces matières," says M. Nault, "le prêtre catholique, indépendamment de l'efficace attachée à sa mission, a un avantage surtout autre scrutateur du cœur humain: c'est d'avoir lu, dans l'exercice de son ministère, une page mystérieuse qui n'est ouverte (the very word!) qu'à lui." (P. 102.) One of two things is here abundantly clear. Either M. Nault has been dipping with unlicensed freedom into this mysterious page; or he has undertaken a task for which he could not be duly qualified. We suspect that he must hold by the first horn of the dilemma; for the book is undoubtedly, *exceptis excipiendis*, a very good manual of the evidences of Christianity. These exceptions, as we have already remarked, occupy but an inconsiderable portion of the work. One of them, which strikes us as very *funny*, we will quote: "Ence qui touche la femme, c'est encore sous la loi évangélique qu'elle a trouvé le pouvoir de vivre vierge et honorée. Du moment où il a été libre au sexe faible de se consacrer à Dieu pour mener une vie spirituelle et sainte, tous les liens terrestres de sujétion qui retenaient la femme ont été brisés: elle est devenue l'égale de l'homme." (P. 100.) This would almost seem to throw M. Nault upon the other horn of the dilemma. We should think he would be somewhat puzzled to find authority in the New Testament for any one of the three positions which this *dictum* either insinuates or asserts. The state of virginity is nowhere marked with especial honour, but rather marriage is an honourable estate, as signifying the mystical union between Christ and his Church; the "*subjection*" of the woman is nowhere cancelled, but enforced; and as to a lady being made equal to a man by going into a nunnery, perhaps nothing more may be meant, than that a monk and a nun are on a par in respect of wisdom and morality, and therefore we shall not venture to argue a matter of such extreme nicety. A more direct objection against Protestants is that "ils ont culte sans sacerdoce," because they have abolished the sacrifice of the mass, and where there is no sacrifice there can be no priest. The fact is, that the Papists have no notion of a *spiritual sacrifice*, any more than of a *spiritual worship*. A pompous idolatry is the very essence of their system. We could wish that the only other cavil in the book were not founded in fact, however inapplicable it is to the purpose which it is made to serve. That there are numerous sects among Protestants is equally true and lamentable; and we fear that those who dis-

sent from a National Church without just cause are guilty of a woful sin. Admitting the fact, however, it is a very different thing from throwing off the abominations of an idolatrous communion, to secede from a Church of acknowledged purity in its faith, on account of some minor points of discipline. We have noticed this work, chiefly as affording an example of the inconsistencies to which even the ablest advocates of the Papal theology are driven: and which, though they lie upon the surface of almost all their publications, are particularly prominent in those wherein a *direct* reference to the Scriptures is almost unavoidable.

ART. III.—*Remains of the late Rev. Richard Hurrell Froude, M.A. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.* London: Rivingtons. 1838. 2 Vols. 8vo. pp. xxiv. 497; 423.

THESE volumes are of a very varied and miscellaneous character; and, as they will be better understood from a knowledge of this fact, we here lay before our readers a synopsis of the Contents.

Vol. I.—Private Journal.—Occasional Thoughts.—Essay on the Age favourable to Works of Fiction.—Letters to Friends.—Poems.—Sayings in Conversation.—Extracts from Journal.

Vol. II.—Sermons, XX.—Portions of Sermons.—Miscellaneous Papers.

We must confess that we hardly ever felt the difficulty of stating our opinion of a work greater than on the present occasion; a difficulty not altogether arising from the varied and miscellaneous nature of the subjects, which touch more or less upon almost every prominent point of Morals, Religion, Politics, Taste, Science, and Literature; but that it would be utterly impossible, in our limits, or indeed without a far more minute and extended analysis than would be fitted for a periodical, and above all a religious publication like THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER, to state our opinions without extreme danger of being misunderstood or misrepresented, on the one side; or of doing injustice to the talents, the opinions, and the very remarkable character of the author, on the other.

This gentleman was intimately connected with the writers of the "Tracts for the Times," in the University of Oxford, to which series of publications also it appears he was himself a contributor; and these "Remains" are now published with a design (to use the expression of the Editors) of "*completing the idea of him as a witness to catholic views.*" They, however, add this caution; that "while they of course concur in his sentiments as a whole, they are not to be understood as rendering themselves responsible for every shade of opinion or expression."

We can conceive nothing more *utterly startling* to the generality of

readers, than the opinions embodied in these Remains. The writer's conviction of the *jus divinum* of the christian priesthood is so great, that it leads him to prefer the Puritans above Queen Elizabeth and the bishops of her day, although *on every other point* there is not even the least shade of sympathy with Puritanism; and the same feelings, more or less, have induced him to speak in terms of no very gentle import of the early Reformers, and of other names which are generally regarded by Churchmen with the utmost veneration. His *sensitiveness* to the evils and abuses which have grown out of the alliance between the Church and State; his very unfavourable judgment of the state and system of our Colonial Church; his ridiculing the notion, so prevalent in society, that the Clergy ought to be *gentlemen*;—these opinions will all perhaps tend to place him, in the judgment of some, among the adherents of the "Voluntary System." Others, again, will find in his strong notions on certain points, and in his favourable judgment of *Monastic Institutions*, a tendency and fondness for Romanism; and will not give themselves the trouble of making those distinctions between Catholicism and Popery, which would explain the whole difficulty. A great boldness and independence in his mode of thinking, allied to a fearless openness of expression, which little heeded consequences, or admitted of cautious guarding against misconception, are peculiarities of the writer, which must be borne in mind, or we shall certainly be liable to form a very erroneous estimate of his real opinions. The boldness, singularity, and apparent paradox of many of them, render this caution any thing but unnecessary.

His declarations on numerous points, and particularly about the Reformation, and the agents in that great revolution, will hardly escape giving offence even to those who on many other points are nearly agreed with him. In this respect, perhaps, he felt himself in a similar situation to that of many persons who, at this time, speak any thing but favourably of those great political changes—Emancipation, Repeal of the Test Act, and the Reform Bill—and yet were once the steady promoters of those measures. They have so far failed of answering the ends proposed, as to leave the mind at liberty now to scrutinize the hollow pretences, the selfish ends, the base compromises by which they were carried; and to lament the dangerous and unholy principles which were mixed up with them, and gained footing by their means; although at the time it was felt that some such changes were required. And so the writer before us would, undoubtedly, have been keenly alive to all the abominations of popery, and to the need of reformation, had he lived three centuries ago; although he now judges of the agents in that reformation, with a *harshness* which is hardly consistent with a fair and candid allowance for the imperfection of human nature, the imbecility of human virtue, and the short-sightedness and contracted views

even of the wisest and the best. However, we will say no more, but lay before our readers such copious extracts from the work as may prove *food for rumination*, and enable them to judge of the writer for themselves.

The following extracts from the very able Preface seem necessary for a due understanding of what is to follow.

The author of the volumes now presented to the Christian reader, was the eldest son of the Venerable Robert H. Froude, Archdeacon of Totness, and was born and died in the parsonage-house of Dartington, in the county of Devon. He was born in 1803, on the Feast of the Annunciation; and he died of consumption, on the 28th of February, 1836, when he was nearly thirty-three, after an illness of four years and a half. He was educated at Eton and Oxford, having previously had the great advantage, while at Ottery Free School, of living in the family of the Rev. George Coleridge. He went to Eton in 1816, and came into residence as a commoner of Oriel College, in the spring of 1821. In 1824 he took the degree of Bachelor of Arts, after having obtained, on his examination, high, though not the highest honours, both in the *Literæ Humaniores* and the *Disciplinæ Mathematicæ et Physicæ*. At Easter 1826, he was elected Fellow of his College, and in 1827 was admitted to his M.A. degree. The same year he accepted the office of Tutor, which he held till 1830. In December 1828 he received Deacon's orders, and the year after Priest's, from the last and present Bishops of Oxford. The disorder which terminated his life first showed itself in the summer of 1831; the winter of 1832, and the following spring, he passed in the south of Europe; and the two next winters, and the year between them (1834), in the West Indies. The illness which immediately preceded his death lasted but a few weeks.

He left behind him a considerable collection of writings, none prepared for publication; of which the following two volumes form a part. The *Journal*, with which the first commences, and which is continued in the *Appendix*, reaches from the beginning of 1826, when he was nearly twenty-three, to the spring of 1828. The "*Occasional Thoughts*" are carried on to 1829. The "*Essay on Fiction*" was written when he was twenty-three; the "*Sermons*" from 1829 to 1833, when he was between twenty-five and thirty. His "*Letters*" begin in 1823, when he was twenty, and are carried down to within a month of his death.—*Preface*, pp. iii.—v.

The following is part of the apology for a *posthumous* publication.

But the present is a peculiar case, a case in which, if the survivors do not greatly deceive themselves, they are best consulting the wishes of the departed by publication, hazardous as that step commonly is. Let the reader, before he condemns, imagine to himself a case like the following. Let him suppose a person in the prime of manhood, (with what talents and acquirements, is not now the question,) devoting himself, ardently yet soberly, to the promotion of one great cause; writing, speaking, thinking on it for years, as exclusively as the needs and infirmities of human life would allow; but dying before he could bring to perfection any of the plans which had suggested themselves to him for its advancement. Let it be certainly known to his friends, that he was firmly resolved never to shrink from any thing not morally wrong, which he had good grounds to believe would really forward that cause: and that it was real pain and disquiet to him if he saw his friends in any way postponing it to his supposed feelings or interests. Suppose further, that having been for weeks and months in the full consciousness of what was soon likely to befall him, he departs, leaving such papers as make up the present collection in the hands of those next to him in blood, without any express direction as to the disposal of them; and that they, taking counsel with the friends on whom he was known

chiefly to rely, unanimously and decidedly judged publication most desirable for that end, which was the guide of his life, and which they too esteemed paramount to all others. Imagine the papers appearing to them so valuable, that they feel as if they had no right to withhold such aid from the cause to which he was pledged: would it, or would it not, be their duty, as faithful trustees, in such case to overcome their own scruples? Would they, or would they not, be justified in believing that they had, virtually, his own sanction for publishing such parts, even of his personal and devotional memoranda, much more of his letters to his friends, as they deliberately judged likely to aid in the general good effect? This case, of a person sacrificing himself altogether to one great object, is not of every-day occurrence; it is not like the too frequent instances of papers being ransacked and brought to light, because the writer was a little more distinguished, or accounted a little wiser or better than his neighbours: it cannot be fairly drawn into a precedent, except in circumstance—equally uncommon.—*Preface*, pp. v.—viii.

The following is to rebut the anticipated charge of *popery*.

These "Remains," it will be found, bear a peculiarly strong testimony against the actual system of Rome; strong, as coming from one who was disposed to make every fair allowance in that Church's favour; who was looking and longing for some fuller development of catholic principles than he could easily find, but who was soon obliged to confess, with undissembled mortification and disappointment, that such development was not to be looked for in Rome. Let the following passages be well considered: they tell but the more decisively against the Papal, or Tridentine system, from the veneration shown in other places towards those fragments of true catholicism, which Rome, by God's providence, still retains.

"[On a friend's saying that the Romanists were schismatics in England, but Catholics abroad.]—'No, H.; they are wretched Tridentines everywhere.'" (Vol. i. p. 434.)

"I never could be a Romanist; I never could think all those things in Pope Pius's Creed necessary to salvation." (*Ibid.*)

"How Whiggery has by degrees taken up all the filth that has been secreted in the fermentation of human thought! Puritanism, Latitudinarianism, *Popery*, Infidelity: they have it all now, and good luck to them!" (Vol. i. p. 340.)

"We found, to our horror, that the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church made the acts of each successive Council obligatory for ever; that what had been once decided could not be meddled with again: in fact, that they were committed finally and irrevocably, and could not advance one step to meet us, even though the Church of England should again become what it was in Laud's time, or indeed what it may have been up to the atrocious Council; for M. — admitted that many things, *e.g.* the doctrine of the mass, which were fixed then, had been indeterminate before. So much for the Council of Trent, for which Christendom has to thank Luther and the Reformers. . . . I own it has altogether changed my notions of the Roman Catholics, and made me wish for the total overthrow of their system: I think that the only *τάπος* now is 'the ancient Church of England;' and, as an explanation of what one means, 'Charles I. and the Nonjurors.'" (Vol. i. pp. 307, 308.)

"I remember you told me that I should come back a better Englishman than I went away; better satisfied, not only that our Church is nearest in theory right, but also that practically, in spite of its abuses, it works better; and, to own the truth, your prophecy is already nearly realized. Certainly I have as yet only seen the surface of things; but what I have seen does not come up to my notions of propriety. These Catholic countries seem in an especial manner *κατέχειν την ἀλθειαν εν δίκῃ*. And the priesthood are themselves so sensible of the hollow basis upon which their power rests, that they dare not resist the most atrocious encroachments of the State upon their privileges. . . . I have seen priests laughing when at the Confessional; and indeed

it is plain, that unless they habitually made light of very gross immorality, three-fourths of the population [of Naples] would be excommunicated. . . . The Church of England has fallen low, and will probably be worse before it is better: but let the Whigs do their worst, they cannot sink us so deep as these people have allowed themselves to fall while retaining all the superficials of a religious country." (Vol. i. pp. 293, 294.)

To these extracts may be added the following, from a letter (also from Naples) which did not come to hand until after the first volume had been printed.

"Since I have been out here, I have got a worse notion of the Roman Catholics than I had. I really do think them idolaters, though I cannot be quite confident of my information as it affects the character of the priests. . . . What I mean by calling these people idolaters is, that I believe they look upon the Saints and Virgin as good-natured people, that will try to get them let off easier than the Bible declares; and that, as they don't intend to comply with the conditions on which God promises to answer prayers, they pray to them as a come-off. But this is a generalization for which I have not sufficient data."—*Preface*, pp. x.—xiv.

The following is to rebut the anticipated charge of not being "*a sound and attached member of the English Establishment.*"

The view which the author would take of his own position was probably this; that he was a minister, not of any human *establishment*, but of the one Holy Church Catholic, which, among other places, is allowed by her Divine Master to manifest herself locally in England, and has in former times been endowed by the piety of her members: that the State has but secured by law those endowments which it could not seize without sacrilege; and, in return for this supposed boon, has encumbered the rightful possession of them by various conditions calculated to bring the Church into bondage: that her ministers, in consequence, are in no way bound to throw themselves into the spirit of such enactments; rather are bound to keep themselves from the snare and guilt of them, and to observe only such a literal acquiescence as is all that the law requires in any case, all that an external oppressor has a right to ask. Their *loyalty* is already engaged to the Church Catholic, and they cannot enter into the drift and intentions of her oppressors without betraying her. For example: they cannot do more than submit to the Statute of *Præmunire*; they cannot defend or concur in the present suspension in every form of the Church's synodal powers, and of her power of Excommunication; nor can they sympathize in the provision which hinders their celebrating five out of the seven daily services which are their patrimony equally with Romanists. Again; doubtless, the spirit in which the present Establishment was framed, would require an affectionate admiring remembrance of Luther and others, for whom there is no evidence that the author of these volumes ever entertained any reverence.—*Preface*, pp. xiv. xv.

We now come to the work itself. The following extracts are chiefly taken from the "Letters to Friends," and we shall begin with his startling language in reference to some of the principal reformers of our Church.

. . . I have been looking into Strype's Memorials and Burnet a good deal, without finding much to like in the Reformers; but I do not see clearly the motives of the different parties. The sincerity of the leading men on both sides seems so equivocal, that I can hardly see what attached them to their respective positions. I have observed one thing, and only one, in favour of my guessed-at theory, that is, that Cranmer had a quarrel with Gardiner about admitting poor people's children to a foundation-school at Canterbury; the

latter insisting on their exclusion. Certainly this was a change in the tone of the High Church party since William of Wykeham's time. Also I have read a volume of Froissart, and been much entertained with it. Edward and his court were on the whole a poor set. They allied themselves with a rascally brewer of Ghent, who had just got up an insurrection in Flanders, as villanous but more successful than this Belgian business; and treated the brewer and his crew as ceremoniously as any nobles. I see also that when Flanders was under excommunication, Master Edward promised to send over English clergy who would perform the offices of the Church, in spite of the Pope, for the above-mentioned scoundrels. In support of Sharon Turner's notion, that the wars of York and Lancaster were religious, I see that the heretics got off very easily in Edward the Fourth's reign. Burnet does not give his authorities, nor does he seem aware that the cases he mentions are not samples of what generally took place. (Vide Hist. Ref. quarto ed. p. 26.) . . . The person whom I like best of all I have read about is Cardinal Pole. He seems a hero of an ideal world, an union of chivalrous and Catholic feeling, like what one hopes to find people before one reads about them. I wish I had his book against Henry the Eighth; Strype gives little more than some letters and a speech.—Vol. i. pp. 253, 254.

Imprimis as to —'s friend Jewell. He calls the mass "your cursed, paltry service," laughs at the apostolical succession both in principle and as a fact, and says that the only succession worth having is the succession of doctrine.* He most distinctly denies the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a means of grace as distinguished from a pledge, calling it a "phantasie of M. Harding's."† He says the only keys of the kingdom of heaven are *instruction* and *correction*,‡ and the only way they open the kingdom is by touching men's consciences; that binding and retaining is preaching that "God will punish wickedness;" loosing and remitting, that "God will pardon on repentance and faith;"§ justifies Calvin for saying that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper "were superfluous," if we remembered Christ's death enough without it;|| ridicules the consecration of the elements, and indirectly explains that the way the body and blood are verily received is that they are *received into our remembrance*.¶ I have got chapter and verse for all this, and would send you my extracts, if it was not too much trouble to copy them out. Certainly the Council of Trent had no fair chance of getting at the truth if they saw no alternative between transubstantiation and Jewellism.

Does not the Archbishop of Canterbury claim patriarchal authority (*qualem qualem*) over as large a portion of the globe as ever the Bishop of Rome did? and are not the colonial Bishops just as much exonerated from their oath of canonical obedience, by proving that there is no universal bishop recognised in Scripture as ever Cranmer was?

I have been much surprised to find that the first latitudinarians were Tories; e. g. Hales, Chillingworth, and that set. How Whiggery has by degrees taken up all the filth that has been secreted in the fermentation of human thought! Puritanism, Latitudinarianism, Popery, Infidelity; they have it all now, and good luck to them.—Vol. i. pp. 339, 340.

Jewell was what you would in these days call an irreverent Dissenter. His Defence of his Apology disgusted me more than almost any work I have read. Bishop Hlices and Dr. Brett I see go all lengths with me in this respect, and I believe Laud did. The Preface to the Thirty-nine Articles was certainly intended to disconnect us from the Reformers.—Vol. i. pp. 379, 380.

When I get your letter, I expect a rowing for my Roman-catholic sentiments. Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more, and have almost made up my mind that the rationalist spirit they set afloat is the

* Def. of Apol. p. 120, 123, 139, ed. 1611.

† Ib. pp. 149, 153.

§ Ib. p. 151.

¶ Ib. pp. 210—212.

† Ib. p. 208.

|| Ib. pp. 152—155.

ῥεδοπροφήτης of the Revelations. I have a theory about the beast and woman too, which conflicts with yours; but which I will not inflict on you now. I have written nothing for a long time, and only read in a desultory, lounging way; but really it is not out of idleness, for I find that the less I do the better I am, and soon principle resist doing a good deal that I am tempted to.—Vol. i. p. 389.

I am sure the Daily Service is a great point, so is kneeling with your back to the people, which, by the by, seems to be striking all apostolicals at once. I was very strongly impressed about it this time year at Caraccas. I was with — when they were consulting how the Consecration Service should be performed at the new burial ground, so as to have the most imposing effect. One of the ends of the intended chapel was ornamented with an altar and cross over it in bas relief. It struck —, as a matter of course, that this should be the station from which the chaplains should read service. At first — acquiesced, for having lived very little in Protestant countries, the possibility that — could intend the clergy to look towards the people never occurred to him: but when he found out what was meant, it was [curious] to see his horror at the idea of praying with one's back towards the cross. He thought it would cause a sensation through all Caraccas. . . . This fell in so much with my floating thoughts, that since then I have been convinced they were not idiosyncratic, however uncommon they may be among Protestants. So I rejoice to see other independent testimonies to the same point. . . .

I am more and more indignant at the Protestant doctrine on the subject of the Eucharist, and think that the principle on which it is founded is as proud, irreverent, and foolish as that of any heresy, even Socinianism. I must write you out a sentence of Pascal on this. My edition is differently arranged from most, so I cannot refer you to it. Speaking of Isai. xlv. 15, he says, "Il a demeuré caché sous la voile de la nature, qui nous le couvre, jusqu'à l'incarnation; et quand il a fallu qu'il ait paru, il s'est encore plus caché, en se couvrant de l'humanité. . . . Enfin, quand il a voulu accomplir la promesse qu'il fit à ses Apôtres de demeurer avec les hommes jusqu'à son dernier avènement, il a choisi demeurer dans le plus étrange et le plus obscur secret de tous, savoir, sous les espèces de l'Eucharistie." And then he goes on to say that deists penetrate the veil of nature, heretics that of the incarnation; "mais pour nous, nous devons nous estimer heureux de ce que Dieu nous éclaire jusqu'à le reconnaître sous les espèces du pain et du vin." I believe you will agree with me that this is orthodox.

Also, why do you praise Ridley? Do you know sufficient good about him to counterbalance the fact that he was the associate of Cranmer, Peter Martyr, and Bucer? N.B. How beautifully the Edinburgh Review has shown up Luther, Melancthon, and Co.! What good genius has possessed them to do our dirty work? . . .

Pour moi, I never mean, if I can help it, to use any phrases even, which can connect me with such a set. I shall never call the Holy Eucharist "the Lord's Supper," nor God's priests "ministers of the word," or the altar "the Lord's table," &c. &c.; innocent as such phrases are in themselves, they have been dirtied: a fact of which you seem oblivious on many occasions. Nor shall I even abuse the Roman Catholics, as a church, for any thing except excommunicating us.

(To be continued.)

LITERARY REPORT.

Useful Knowledge, no Substitute for Religious Knowledge, in a Scheme of National Education. A Sermon, preached at St. Peter's, Colchester, in behalf of the United National Schools of that Town, September 19, 1837. By J. J. BLUNT, B.D. Rector of Great Oakley, Essex, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Murray, 1837. Pp. 24.

THIS is a discourse full of sound learning, just reasoning, and practical, living Christianity. It is what a sermon should be; and nothing more comprehensive, nothing more appropriate, could have been desired for the occasion upon which it was delivered. It should be circulated by thousands in our great towns and manufacturing districts. It is calculated to survive the occasion, and to remain as a perpetual bulwark in the defence of a christian system of National Education.

The Style and Composition of the Writings of the New Testament no way inconsistent with the Belief that the Writers of them were Divinely Inspired. An Essay, which obtained the Norrisian Medal for 1836, in the University of Cambridge. By JOHN DECK, Scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge. Printed at the Pitt Press. 1837. Pp. 49.

THIS Essay does great credit to the writer, whose style is at once simple and sufficiently ornate, and more formed than is usually the case with young authors. Extraordinary is the objection it refutes, and most extraordinary that it should be raised by men who could not have been insensible to the overwhelming sublimity and unrivalled pathos with which holy Scripture abounds. This is indeed the very fastidiousness of the pride of unbelief; the very folly of folly.

A Collection of Hymns for the Use of Church of England Sunday Schools. Cambridge. 1838. Pp. 134.

THIS little volume contains 198 hymns. Many of these are admirably adapted to the design of this book. It is indeed an advance in this kind of publication. We would suggest, in a future edition, the omission of hymns 135, 164, 183. There is no need of *trifling*, nor do we admire the singing of hymns to our national air. We are inclined to doubt the devotion that can sing song-like melodies to God, and for no better reason than that they are *popular*. Ken's Morning and Evening hymns are omitted. We are at a loss to opine a reason for this.

We regret to find so scanty and poor a selection of hymns for "Particular Sundays and Remarkable Days." It appears that the compiler, who, we understand, is a clergyman in Cambridge, rejects the more usual style of "Fasts and Festivals," "Sundays and Holy Days." It would have been far more suitable to a work expressly designed for Church of England Schools, to have retained it.

We are the more anxious to point out these defects, because, as a whole, this little volume is a fair and successful effort; nor is any labour of the ministerial office more honourable than that which is bestowed upon the young. It is a labour, which, of all others, returns in blessings upon the head of the humble pastor, and especially glorifies our religion as a yoke of meekness.

A Sermon, preached at the Visitation of the Bishop of Lincoln at Amer-sham, September 12, 1837. By the Hon. and Rev. S. G. OSBORNE. London: Nisbet. 1837.

THE author of this discourse, after a few introductory remarks upon his text (Psalm cxxvii. 1), applies the words to our own Communion, and

remarks that "it is useless to deny the fact that there is danger from without her walls; that there is danger within our Church." (P. 4.)

In p. 5 he affirms, that "we surely have no just cause to complain of a lack of either means or opportunity to fulfil our work." It is indeed admitted, that, "in some instances, from the rapid increase of population, there is not room for all who would join in our services." It must surely, on the other hand, be conceded, that the Church is *very far* from possessing means commensurate with the implied obligations of a religious establishment, namely, a provision for the religious instruction and worship of the whole of our population. We might easily fill page after page with the discouragements under which the Church of England goes to her work and labour of love.

As there is evidently a sincerity in the spirit of Mr. Osborne, we will only desire, that all those of his brethren who shall peruse his discourse, may seriously apply to themselves the hints which he throws out. We feel with him, that the clerical character should be always distinguishable from the secular. We feel with him, that earnestness in our calling is too important to be laid aside, or drowned, through the fear of fanaticism. We feel with him, that the false liberalism of this age is not the spirit of *christian unity*, or compatible with *christian truth*.

The writer, in his strictures upon the "Oxford Tract Divinity," asserts of "the authors and promoters of it," that "they abuse the faith of the Romanist, while they are gradually adopting the forms of his religion." Little as we are inclined to rank ourselves amongst the implicit followers of that class of writers, or of any other school, we cannot but think that this attack is unadvisedly made. To us they appear to err in the contrary extreme. The 71st Number of the "Tracts for the Times" is, to a considerable extent, rather a palliation of Romish peculiarities than an abusing of Romish dogmas.

An Earnest Protest against the further Circulation of certain Principles contained in the Pamphlet of the Hon. and Rev. BAPTIST W. NOEL, M.A. entitled "The Unity of the Church," &c. Especially addressed to its Author. By CLERICUS SURRIENSIS. London: Seeleys. 1837. 12mo. Pp. 42.

A Defence of a Tract entitled, "The Unity of the Church," being a Letter to CLERICUS SURRIENSIS, in Answer to his "Earnest Protest." By the Hon. and Rev. BAPTIST WRIOTHESLEY NOEL, M.A. London: Seeleys. 1837. 12mo. Pp. 32.

IN noticing Mr. Noel's "Unity of the Church," we confined ourselves to the mere exposure of his grand mistake in confounding *christian unity* with *christian love*; as it is manifestly impossible for us, except upon particular occasions, to enter very minutely into the merits or demerits of every ephemeral pamphlet. The exertions, however, which have been made, especially by the Dissenters, to distribute the tract, has given it a more than ordinary importance; and we are truly rejoiced that its sophisms and false liberality have been pointed out at length by *Clericus Surriensis*. Mr. Noel's defence appears to be made up of childish recrimination on one hand, and a vain endeavour on the other, to explain away the principles which are justly attributed to him in the "Earnest Protest." A weaker attempt at a reply has seldom been put forth; and the little piece of egotism at the end, is a very poor excuse for what the author evidently feels to be a lame vindication. We leave the dispute between the two combatants; merely hinting to *Clericus*, that he would do well to pay more attention to his punctuation, and, indeed, to the general construction of his periods. In several instances we have found ourselves puzzled in the intricacies of a sentence, which it required some consideration to unravel. A rejoinder is, we conceive, an improbable affair; for Mr. Noel's second pamphlet has gone very far to demolish his first.

Think! London: Mitchell. 1838. 32mo. Pp. 48.

If the maxim *γνώθι σεαυτὸν* was worthy of a sage, the word *Think!* conveys a precept of like importance to the Christian. To *think* of those things in which "there is any virtue and any praise," is the readiest means of leading to the practice of them; and this unpretending little book, consisting of prayers and meditations, with some well-selected pieces of sacred poetry, is intended to supply some useful subjects of thought, and the best aids for thinking aright. "Those who have no time to THINK," suggests the writer, "must find a time to DIE."

Pluralism and Non-residence unnecessary, injurious, and indefensible; and their entire Prohibition practical and indispensable to the Security, Extension, and Efficiency of the National Church; with Statistical Tables, founded on public Documents. By a CLERGYMAN. London: Nisbet and Hamilton. 1838. 8vo. Pp. 23.

HOWEVER plausible in appearance, the entire abolition of pluralities and non-residence is, we imagine, neither possible nor desirable. Let their abuses be swept away thoroughly; but there are many cogent reasons, which we have frequently stated, for vesting in the diocesan a limited discretionary power with regard to their use. The pamphlet before us is valuable for its statistical details; nor is the argument founded upon them without weight, provided it were restricted to a legitimate reformation, and not directed to the total extermination of a system, which certainly is not absolutely "indefensible."

Religious Education: A Sermon, preached at Camden Chapel, Camberwell, on Sunday, January 28, 1838, after the reading of the Queen's Letter on behalf of the National Society. By HENRY MELVILL, B.D. London: Rivingtons. 1838. 8vo. Pp. 36.

THIS sermon is in Mr. Melvill's best manner. The division of the subject

into the precept contained in the text (Prov. xxii. 6), and the encouragement which it offers to secure obedience, readily presents itself; but the accuracy with which the promise is brought within its just limitations, and the preacher's just appreciation of what is meant by a religious education, merit the most serious attention, not only as applied to the objects of the National Society, but as applicable to the duties of every christian parent. We would willingly quote the remarks on this latter point, which occur at pp. 14, &c.; but it would be an injustice to the sermon to offer any excuse for the neglect of its entire perusal.

The Persecuting Principles and Corrupt Practices of the Church of Rome. Two Sermons, preached in the Parish Church of Ashby-de-la-Zouch, on Sunday, November 5, 1837. By T. FELL, M.A. Curate. Ashby: Hextall. London: Rivingtons. 1837. 8vo. Pp. 43.

ALTHOUGH the representative of her Majesty in Ireland did not hesitate to sanction at least, if not to command, the omission of the national service of thanksgiving to Almighty God in the Chapel Royal, for that signal deliverance from Papal violence, to which, perhaps, his young mistress may be indebted for the continuance of the Protestant succession, and consequently for her crown; we are proud and happy in the belief that the solemnity was duly observed in less elevated stations, and that the opportunity was seized in a multitude of instances, for awakening the people of England to a sense of the blessings which they enjoy by the expulsion of Papal tyranny and Papal perfidy, from the land of their fathers. The sermons before us were called forth by that occasion; and their requested publication is a proof that the importance of their object was sensibly felt, and that there is not that deep and deadly apathy to the Protestant cause which is generally supposed to exist. They are good plain discourses, admirably adapted to the congregation of a

country town; and they state the question between Protestants and Romanists broadly, fairly, and powerfully. The former is devoted to the persecuting spirit of Popery, while it illustrates papal statutes and decrees, and proves them to be unchanged and unchangeable; and the latter, after adverting to the corruptions of the Romish Church in general, selects two of them for more especial consideration. These are the prevention of the free use of the Bible, and the denial of the doctrine of justification by faith. In conclusion, the preacher offers some forcible remarks on the benefits derived to the poor, from being enabled to join in prayers which they can understand, instead of bowing in dumb ignorance to an image of the Virgin.

Œuvres de Claude Arvisenet. 15 vols. 32mo. Bruxelles. 1837.

THIS is a remarkably neat little Belgian pocket edition of the works of Arvisenet, at half-a-franc *per volume*. The writings of this author are not, we believe, much known in England; and as they are chiefly designed for the young, it is as well that they are not; for, although their mild and amiable spirit bespeaks a true disciple of Christ, yet the Romish errors are occasionally upheld, and her peculiar tenets tacitly, if not pointedly, recognised. Of course, we have no right or intention to object to this in a member of the Papal communion; whereas, on the other hand, with minds firmly fixed and settled against the admission of what we believe to be corrupt, we cannot withhold praise where it is due to literary merit, and to a sincere endeavour to promote the cause of religious truth. There is much, very much, in all of Arvisenet's volumes, which, if separated from the doctrines of an apostate church, must be read with advantage by Christians of every denomination.

Britannia Saxonica. By G.W. COLLEN. London: Pickering. 4to. Pp. 55.

WE consider this book as indispensably necessary to the clear under-

standing of that portion of our English history to which it refers. Mr. Collen has evidently taken great pains to make the work as perfect as possible, nor do we know any one to whose hands we should have assigned the elucidation of this portion of history with better hope of success than those of the author before us: it is with pleasure, therefore, that we recommend the volume to the notice of our readers.

The Prose Works of the Right Rev. Father in God, Thomas Ken, D.D. sometime Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells. To which are added (qu. prefixed ?) some of his Letters (never before published), and a short Account of his Life by William Hawkins, Esq. his Executor. The whole collected by JAMES THOMAS ROUND, B.D. Rector of St. Runwald's and St. Nicholas, Colchester, and late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1838. Svo. Pp. xii. 494.

UNDER any circumstances we are obliged to Mr. Round for his editorial labours in collecting the scattered works of Bishop Ken; and the sound practical piety which he has thus embodied, will be received as a treasure of great price by the sincere and contemplative Christian. The brief account of the Prelate's life might with advantage have given place to a more satisfactory memoir from the able pen of Mr. Round himself, with such of the letters as are really important, introduced in their proper connexion. The pieces contained in the volume are three Sermons; an Exposition of the Church Catechism; Directions for Prayer; a Manual of Prayer for the use of the Winchester Scholars, and all other devout Christians, with the three celebrated Hymns for Morning, Evening, and Midnight, annexed; Prayers for the use of all persons who come to the Baths for cure; two Pastoral Letters; and Articles of Visitation and Inquiry, addressed to the Clergy, Churchwardens, and Sidesmen of his Diocese. The volume will be read with interest by all who venerate good Bishop Ken.

N N

A SERMON

FOR THE ASCENSION.

PSALM LXVIII. 18.

Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive; thou received gifts for men: yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them.

THE Scriptures inform us that our Saviour, after his resurrection from the dead, remained upon the earth forty days, "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." This length of time was necessary in order to convince every one of the reality of his resurrection, by giving them every proof of it which could be given. The belief in the resurrection was first to be established, that a belief in the ascension might follow. If he had not risen from the dead, he could not have ascended up alive into heaven. Let us follow him thither, brethren, in our meditations this day; let our thoughts rise above this mortal scene, while we contemplate the ascension of our exalted Saviour, and its consequences as they affect our souls. "He hath ascended on high; he hath led captivity captive; he received gifts for men: yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them." 1st. I shall consider in these words the person addressed, and the act supposed—"Thou hast ascended on high." 2dly. The circumstance involved in it—"Thou hast led captivity captive." 3dly. The fruits and consequences—"Thou hast received gifts for men: yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them."

I. First, then, as to the person addressed, and the act supposed. If we look back through the whole antecedent part of the Psalm in which our text occurs, we shall perceive that God is peculiarly and immediately the object of invocation. We may understand this the better by reverting to the occasion of its being composed—the removal of the ark of God from the house of Obadedom the Gittite, to the Mount Sion. It is supposed to be a laudatory hymn, sung by the Priests and Levites on that occasion, as they advanced in procession towards the Mount of God. When the ark had at length ascended, and been deposited in the place assigned for its reception, this part of the Psalm is supposed to have commenced, in which the complete triumph of God, and in him of David over all his enemies, is celebrated in the words of my text—"Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive; thou received gifts for men: yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them." Evidently, then, in the primary sense of the words, the Almighty God, who "giveth victory unto kings," was the person addressed. The God and King of Israel had in Spirit ascended the hill of Sion, because the holy ark, the symbol of his presence among them, had reached the same triumphant destination. Therefore the king, the priests, and the minstrels of Israel congratulated, as it were, their divine Ruler upon his glorious triumph; "Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men: yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord

God might dwell among them." But the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, has given a more extended and mysterious meaning to the words in question. He applies them in this secondary sense to the victorious ascension of the God of our salvation, even our divine Redeemer, into heaven; who in his ascension most signally "overcame death, and opened unto us the gate of everlasting life." "But unto every one of us," says he, "is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." We may therefore conclude, that though the God of Israel is here originally addressed, yet in him figuratively and prophetically is addressed that second person of the Trinity, the Incarnate Word, who in the fulness of time was to be made in the "likeness of men, to become obedient to death, even the death of the cross, but afterwards to be given a name which would be above every name." The act supposed in the first instance, was evidently the ascent and elevation of the material ark from the house of Obbedom, which was, when compared with the mount to which it was raised, as it were in "the lower parts of the earth." The act secondarily and more darkly intimated was, doubtless, the bodily removal of our blessed Saviour from this lower world to the spiritual Zion, even the heavenly Jerusalem. The words, "on high," must be exclusively interpreted of the Messiah, who would ascend to that high place whither no other conqueror had ever ascended. In the seventh Psalm the prophet prays that the Lord would "return on high;" which in the Chaldean language is paraphrased, "Return to the house of thy majesty." And it is said in another Psalm, "The Lord on high is mightier." These expressions evidently shadow out that inconceivably exalted region, far above all heavens, where the Son of God, together with the Father and the Holy Ghost, had reigned from all eternity; but into which the Son of Man, as such, was now for the first time to enter.

II. Let us, in the second place, consider the circumstance involved in it: "Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive." The same figure of speech occurs in Judges v. 12, where Deborah and Barak are celebrating in song the glories of their victory. They invite and summon themselves, as it were, to join the triumphal pageant: "Awake, awake, Deborah, utter a song; arise, Barak, and lead thy captivity captive, thou son of Abinoam." Of course in both cases we are to understand by the words, "leading captivity captive," the subjection of enemies, hitherto victorious, together with all the accompaniments of spoils, captives, and accumulated dominion. This was true in the case of Deborah, and of David. But as this passage may comprehend the achievements of a more glorious conqueror, and a completer and more effective conquest over mightier and more formidable enemies, the circumstance involved in this spiritual triumph is more interesting to us than the one alluded to in the triumphs of David. Thou our God and Saviour, in thy ascension into heaven, "hast led captivity captive;" for "having spoiled principalities and powers, thou hast made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it." From the Fall downwards, sin, Satan, and death, became the enemies of man; and he was incapable of struggling against them, without something more efficient

than mere human resources. Besides outward, he had inward enemies—a corrupt heart, and evil passions. He was as a kingdom, a family, a house, “divided against itself;” which, in such a situation, can never stand, independent even of external hostility. We are not, then, to wonder that man, with distracting commotions within, should fall a prey to enemies without. He became “a captive to the law of sin, which was in his members;” and was “all his lifetime subject to bondage,” the slave of sin, tyrannized over by the malignancy of the powers of darkness, and the prevailing arm of death. But the Deliverer, who was to lead captivity captive, did at last appear. When Satan, the “strong man armed, kept his palace, his goods were in peace; but when a stronger than he, even Christ, came upon him and overcame him, he took from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divided his spoils.” He stripped death of its sting, and the grave of its victory; for he overcame both, in that he overcame him “who had the power” of both, even the devil. He triumphed over sin in his life, over death and hell in his resurrection, and over all united in his ascension. The slave was made free, for he was redeemed; the tyrants were led captive, for they were overcome. In this sense then, when “he ascended on high,” did our conquering Saviour in that act “lead captivity captive.” We may now “know the truth, and the truth makes us free;” our hearts, our affections, our understandings are unfettered, for we are under “the perfect law of liberty,” and a “service of perfect freedom.” Let us not, therefore, cling to our chains and be in love with slavery, but “come unto Him whose yoke is easy, and whose burden is light.” “Let us stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free;” that “as sin hath reigned unto death, even so grace may reign unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.”

III. I was to state, thirdly, the fruits and consequences of the ascension of our Lord—“Thou hast received gifts for men: yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them.” The result of a splendid victory is generally a distribution of the spoils in gifts and largesses among the victorious soldiery and populace. So the God, who on this occasion gained the victory for Israel, and whose ark had now ascended the Mount Zion, is represented as assigning and dividing the spoils among his favoured, though rebellious people. It should be observed, that there is a variation between the words of the Psalmist and the Apostle. The Psalmist says, “Thou hast received gifts for men;” the Apostle, “He gave gifts unto men.” This is easily explained by reverting to the Hebrew idiom, according to which the taking of a gift for another, is the same as the giving of it to another. We frequently find our blessed Lord informing his Apostles, that upon his departure the Holy Ghost should be given or sent to them. St. Peter calls it, “The gift of the Holy Ghost.” These, then, are the bounties and gifts of victory (because no other are mentioned or implied in Scripture), which the conquering Messiah, after he “had ascended on high, and led captivity captive,” was to dispense among his faithful servants and subjects, even the graces and inspirations of the Holy Spirit. Forty days after the ascension, and upon the day of Pentecost, the Scripture informs us that “there appeared unto the Apostles cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them; and they were

all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." These endowments (as our Saviour foretold, and the event proved) were, as regarded the Apostles, extraordinary and miraculous; for they immediately began to act and speak, understand and think, in a manner unlike common mortals. Men unusually ignorant before, were now "guided into all truth." Men of ordinary uncultivated talents had "a mouth and wisdom, which their adversaries could neither gainsay nor resist." Men with little historical knowledge of past events were let into the secrets of futurity; "they were shown things to come." "To one was given, by the Spirit, the word of wisdom; to another, the word of knowledge, by the same Spirit; to another, faith, by the same Spirit; to another, the gifts of healing, by the same Spirit. To another, the working of miracles; to another, prophecy; to another, discerning of spirits; to another, divers kinds of tongues; to another, the interpretation of tongues. But all these worked that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he would." But these were not the only gifts which the Divine Conqueror at his ascension on high was to receive for men; and the Apostles were not the only men for whom they were to be so received. "Repent," says St. Peter, on the day of Pentecost, "and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost: for the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Our Saviour also intimates that the gift of the Spirit is at least offered to every one at his baptism: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." This gift has a sanctifying, a strengthening, and a preventing power in the well-disposed Christian; and it illuminates, remodels, and refashions the depraved and unholy heart of the rebellious sinner. In the former it is actually indwelling; in the latter, it is struggling for an entrance: but in neither has it an overwhelming, an invincible, or exclusive agency. Yet, without it, we could do little or nothing; so much so, that, "by grace are we saved through faith." And that there may be no inlet to self-sufficiency on the part of man for the share he has in it, and that "boasting may be excluded," he adds, "and that not of ourselves; it is the gift of God." Nor can man put in any claim to it, in the first instance; otherwise it would be a debt, and not a gift. It is graciously tendered even to the rebellious and exiles from the kingdom of God; and those are, strictly speaking, all men—for "all have sinned;" and where God is the king, sin is rebellion. But since the sins of all mankind were borne and punished in the person of Christ, God considers those only who continue perseveringly impenitent and sinful as rebels against his Divine Majesty. Yet even to them offers of grace are made from time to time; for "where sin hath abounded, the mercy of God would have grace much more to abound." Our Lord would have all men, even the rebellious, to become at last his temple, by his Spirit dwelling in them; because, upon his ascension, he "received gifts for men, yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them."

Let me now offer a few observations in conclusion. You, upon whose hearts the gift of the grace of God has as yet made no impression, think for a few moments upon the consequences of a persevering and persisting

rejection of it. "Unto every one that hath," says our Saviour, "shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath." The advances and suggestions of the Spirit, met, encouraged, and acted upon, will surely be followed by increased and more abundant supplies of grace; the same Spirit resisted, refused, and despised in its influences, will be totally and finally withdrawn. "The Spirit helpeth your infirmities;" but if you reject his help, you will be left to yourselves; and then your misdeeds and infirmities will prevail against you, and you will die hardened in your sins, and unforgiven. You refuse to admit him into your soul now; he will refuse to admit you into heaven hereafter: for "if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Perhaps some one may be saying, "I have a favourite and besetting sin, which I cannot resolve to abandon, it is so pleasant; and, if I were ever so inclined to abandon it, I have not now the power." Pray to God for his strengthening grace, which will incline you to resolve, and assist you in resolving, to abandon it. If one most beloved sin, a right hand, or a right eye, will prevent your entering into the kingdom of heaven, "cut it off, pluck it out, and cast it from you; for it is profitable for you that one of your members perish, and not that your whole body should be cast into hell." You, on the other hand, who would almost complain of destitution, temptation, prayers unanswered, the assisting gifts of the spirit and grace of God not vouchsafed to you, although your intentions and endeavours are sincere, should remember that David "never saw the righteous forsaken" by God, and seldom by man; that "you are never tempted above what you are able to bear;" that perhaps you have not prayed as you ought, or for what you ought; and that with regard to the Spirit, perhaps he has already begun to work in your heart silently and unperceivably, as he always does, though not the less surely. You should not be so much disposed to lay the blame upon God as upon yourselves:—your own natural dejection of mind, which looks at the sad side of every thing, which will say there is no comfort when there is a Comforter; that there is no peace when there is "the peace of God, which the world cannot give, and which passeth all understanding." Remember, also, that your loving Redeemer, when he ascended on high, led those enemies captive whom you complain of; that he left you his divine armour and weapons to combat their weakened, crushed, and curtailed strength with; that he then received gifts for all men, even for his enemies; and did he not for you, who love him? Were you alone left out? Was not the object of all this that "the Lord God might dwell among his people," when there would be "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." And if you are sensible that God dwells in you, near you, and about you, whom or what is there to fear? Who will approach, and who can prevail against you, when He who controlleth all things is your shield, your Saviour, and your guide? "The Lord is on my side," says David; "I will not fear what man doeth unto me;" and, we may add, hell either. Wherefore, my beloved brethren, lift up the languid eye, the feeble knees, and the drooping heart! Behold the Lord your Redeemer, who has at this time "ascended on high, led captivity captive, and received gifts for men: yea, for the

rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them." Join, therefore, the song of the angels, as they conduct Him to his Father's right hand : "Lift up your heads," say they, "O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory ? The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle. Lift up your heads, O ye gates, even lift them up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory ? The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory."

Tirley Vicarage.

J. F. H.

MISCELLANEOUS.

AMERICAN LITURGY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

SIR,—Since you have been so kind as to insert my remarks on the American Liturgy in your valuable periodical, you will, perhaps, allow me to direct the notice of your readers to the remaining parts of their Book of Common Prayer, which have not been noticed by your former correspondent. There is an appointed form for morning and evening prayer in private families, with a clause specially appropriate for Sunday mornings ; there is a form for the consecration of churches and chapels, nearly the same as that generally used in our own Church : but I do not know, and you will perhaps be good enough to inform me, whether *we* have any form authorised by Parliament and Convocation. They have a form of prayer and thanksgiving for the fruits of the earth, to be used the first Thursday in November, or any other day which may be appointed by the civil authority ; a prayer to be used at the meetings of Convention ; and an office of institution of Ministers into parishes or churches. The Articles are the same in number and substance as our own ; there are only two variations of any interest in them, viz., in the 21st and 37th Articles. The 21st stands thus, being numbered as Article 21, but having the following note appended to it : "The 21st of the former Articles is omitted, because it is partly of a local and civil nature, and is provided for as to the remaining parts of it in other Articles."

The 37th runs as follows ; its title is, "Of the Power of the Civil Magistrates." "The power of the civil magistrate extendeth to all men, as well Clergy as Laity, in all things temporal, but hath no authority in things *purely spiritual* ; and we hold it to be the duty of all men who are professors of the Gospel to pay respectful obedience to the civil authority regularly and legitimately constituted." With regard to these variations, there will probably be little difference of opinion ; and no one will deny that an Article such as this last is indispensable in a country like America, where there is no established Church, where the civil authority is a mixture of all creeds, and where the Episcopal communion forms only a small minority of the population, less than one million in a population of more than eleven millions. How melancholy it is to see so few adherents to the true Church ! But this is the effect of having no establishment, and of the voluntary system ; and the same thing would take place here, it is to be feared, if the voluntaries were once to obtain their wishes.

There are some alterations in their prayers and thanksgivings for fair weather and in time of dearth and famine, but so slight that it is scarcely necessary to state them at full length ; but I may just observe that the word "cheapness" in our ritual, is omitted in theirs, and also the words "beasts increase and fishes do multiply."

Before quitting the subject, I would submit whether it is not a great improvement to allow, as the American Church does, parents to stand sponsors for their own children.

I confess that, upon the whole, I have been much pleased by a perusal of the American Liturgy. It is highly gratifying to see a body of christian professors, under a totally different form of civil polity to our own, thus firmly adhering to the faith once delivered to the saints. And even in those parts which your intelligent correspondent has shown to be in some degree objectionable, there is, perhaps, taking all things into consideration, not *very much* to find fault with. The only thing that appears to me decidedly objectionable, is the abrupt termination of the Marriage ceremony, and the omission of the concluding exhortations from Holy Scripture ; at the same time that it will, perhaps, be allowed, that our own is considered to be, if any thing, rather too long than too short. But the Americans should at least have retained the concluding exhortations.

With respect to the Ordination service, no sound Churchman will deny that the most injurious consequences would arise if Ordination were to be conferred in terms which implied no spiritual influence and authority ; but yet, may it not be questioned whether the words "Take thou *authority* to execute the office of a priest in the Church of God," are chargeable with this defect ; they seem nearly to imply the same thing as the other form, though in different words : *authority* must signify *spiritual* authority.

With regard to the Burial service, I will only just observe that the rubric expressly forbids its being used for unbaptised adults or excommunicate persons.

I think the words "*spiritually* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper," in the Catechism, and the *additional* beautiful preface for Trinity Sunday in the Communion, are improvements ; but the *great* improvement, as your correspondent has remarked, is the Prayer of Consecration of the Elements. And I trust that, if ever a Convocation should revise our Liturgy, this most beautiful composition will be adopted, together with those other points adverted to by your correspondent. But let it always be borne in mind, that Churchmen never can consent to have one word of their present admirable Liturgy altered, except by and with the advice and consent of a Convocation regularly and legitimately constituted.

Will you allow me to conclude with a few words in explanation of my former letter, which appears with an inaccuracy which doubtless arose from my own inadvertence in writing. I meant to say that, *now* the person who appoints our Bishops may be, *not* secretly but *avowedly*, an infidel or a heretic. So long as the ministers and legislature were all members of the Established Church, and that Church was firm in the national affection and veneration, whatever might be the *secret* opinion of an individual minister was of no great consequence, for he

was obliged by a moral force, superior to his own, to do justice to the Church in appointing her Bishops. But the danger is, when the ministers and Parliament are a motley mixture of all creeds, and when the minister can glory in his shame, and unblushingly avow his intention of inflicting "a heavy blow and a great discouragement" on the Established Church

L. Y. PHOENIX.

ON THE REAL PRESENCE IN THE EUCHARIST.

SIR,—Permit me to lay before your readers the following brief remarks, which, I trust, will be found not inapplicable to the present time, in which the Romish controversy is to all appearance reviving, and with just reason attracting universal interest.

It is not unusual for the Romanist to ask why those who maintain the Real Presence, dissent from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and why they speak so harshly of a tenet so similar to his own?

For my own part, I am one of those who believe that it had been better for the Church, if neither the terms "transubstantiation," "consubstantiation," nor "real presence," had been introduced into it. The very retaining of the term appears to have induced men to cloud the true doctrine of Scripture, to introduce new mysteries into the Church, and then to demand a belief in them as the very greatest points of the christian religion. Thus we hear an author declaiming after this manner: "They who marvel with Nicodemus, at the minor mystery—the comparatively 'earthly' truth of baptismal regeneration—will marvel more at being told that the body of Christ was, in a mysterious manner, present at the same time in the heaven of heavens, and on earth among his faithful!" What would be the effect of such a sentence on the mind of the hearer? Would it not be that the body of Christ was in a mysterious manner as truly present to the unworthy as to the penitent and faithful communicant? Our author proceeding to apply the latter part of the sixth chapter of St. John to the Eucharist, remarks. "He then adds, 'For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.' Can we *presume to understand this*?—or call it a shadow?—*a figure*? or shall we be 'offended at it,' like those who immediately exclaimed, 'This is a hard saying; who can hear it?' The Catholic Church teaches us a humble spirit. Jesus said it, and we believe it. 'His flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed.' We ask not how it is; we try not to rationalize, or explain away Christ's words. We attempt not to spiritualize them into metaphors. They are realities, and though our understandings 'see not,' our hearts believe." I would ask if the writer of this passage verily believes that Christ's body is in his hands after he has pronounced the words of institution, why does he not adore it, seeing that he has in his hands in a mysterious manner, and *not figuratively*, both the flesh and blood of his Redeemer? Certainly, St. Augustine did not conceive that he was rationalizing, when he did explain this very chapter figuratively. "*Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus sum vobis. Non hoc*

corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis: sacramentum aliquod commendavi vobis; spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos." Understand spiritually what I have said unto you. Ye shall not eat this body which ye see. I have commended unto you a sacrament; spiritually understood, it shall give you life. (Enarratio in Ps. 98.)

Nor did Jeremy Taylor, who has taken up the whole subject of the Real Presence scholastically, conceive he was rationalizing, when, in the sixth section of his book on the Real Presence, he interpreted *est* by *significat* in *est corpus meum*, alleging St. Augustine on the 37th Psalm, "nemo recordatur nisi quod in præsentiâ non est positum." "No one calls to mind a thing already in his presence." And again, St. Augustine, in his memorable epistle (the 23d in the older editions, the 98th in the Benedictine, p. 267, tom. 2, A.D. 1679) says, "Nempe sæpe ita loquimur, ut Pascha propinquant dicamus, crastinam vel perendinam Domini passionem, cum ille antè tam multos annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel illa passio facta sit. Nempe, ipso die dominico dicimus, Hodie Diminus resurrexit; cum ex quo resurrexit tot annitranterint. Cur nemo tam ineptus est, ut nos ita loquentes arguat esse mentitos, nisi quia istos dies secundum illorum, quibus hæc gesta sunt, similitudinem nuncupamus, ut dicatur ipse dies qui non est ipse, sed revolutione temporis similis ejus: et dicatur illo die fieri, propter sacramenti celebrationem, quod non illo die, sed jam olim factum est? Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso, et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes Paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur, nec utique mentitur, qui interrogatus, eum responderit immolari? Si enim sacramenta quamdam similitudinem earum rerum quorum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo, secundum quandam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est." And again, St. Augustine, treating of the same place with our author, the 6th chapter of St. John, says, in the 16th chapter of his third Book De Doctrinâ Christianâ, p. 52, tom. 3, ed. Benedict. "Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem filii hominis et sanguinem liberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoriâ, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit." This is all the "real presence" of the primitive Church, or of our own; nor is it the less impressive for its being less mystically expressed. Whoever will carefully peruse the first section of Jeremy Taylor on the Real Presence, will perceive, notwithstanding occasional flourishes rather of the poet than of the divine, that all he intended to convey by the term "real presence," was that "Christ's body is present to our spirits only, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith, or spiritual susception," (p. 14;) "present not only in type or figure, but in blessing and real effect" (p. 16). And this could as well be expressed without the term real presence as with it.

What then is the mystery of the sacraments? No other than is common to every infusion of divine grace. We know not how grace is communicated. All supernatural operation is mysterious, whether in

one or in another act of worship. And thus the mystery is equal in either sacrament. But those who veil a truth in dark and ambiguous phraseology, prepare the people for idolatry and superstition, as do rationalists for infidelity.

AUGUSTINUS.

THE LAITY'S DIRECTORY FOR 1838.

THE Laity's Directory for the present year, contains the Romish Calendar, the Plenary Indulgences, and the conditions of them; the names of the Romish Chapels and Clergy in England and Wales, charitable institutions, &c.

From an examination of these pages, it is evident that as yet Romanism has, notwithstanding all its boasts, made but an inconsiderable advance in Great Britain. In the last five years, the number of chapels in Scotland does not appear to have increased at all, and in England and Wales only to the amount of twenty-five. In 1831, there were in England and Wales 403, and, in 1837, but 428 Romish chapels. In Scotland, there are about sixty congregations.*

In p. 78 is the following remarkable passage, singularly illustrative of the *charity* of the Romish church, and of the readiness of Romanists to catch at an opportunity of identifying the cause of Protestantism with that of falsehood. It is under the head of "Grantham, Lincolnshire." "It is most confidently expected that the building (a new chapel) will be commenced very early in the spring. An orator at a late Reformation-meeting, which was held here, told the saints of Melton, that there *should not be* a Catholic chapel in their town, but the Catholics of the town and neighbourhood appear determined to make him turn out to be a false prophet, and they *humbly petition* the Catholic public to enable them to prove to their neighbours that their religion essentially differs from the character given it by these *hireling defamers*; and that whilst it abhors their calumny and uncharitable misrepresentation, its object is to give glory to God on high, and promote peace on earth amongst men of good will." We imagine, therefore, that to promote charity and piety, these devout Christians ridicule their Protestant brethren with the name of "Saints!"

Nothing can exceed the elegance, if not splendour, of some of the Romish establishments in our country. How is it that, with a religion so zealous for sanctity, charity, and faith, so singular a catalogue of complaints as the following should have found its way into the Laity's Directory?

"TO THE BENEVOLENT CATHOLIC PUBLIC.

"Sedgley near Wolverhampton.

"Having witnessed the *direful effects* of my children going to *Protestant penny-a-week schools*, I resolved to attempt the erecting one of my own. That I have done. It is capable of holding more than a hundred

* A very different statement has lately been made at Exeter Hall. The information published in the Laity's Directory is voluntarily communicated, and may possibly be inaccurate. We shall be thankful if any correspondent will favour us with any statistical information of a similar kind.

scholars ; but being obliged to charge the full price of regular schools, in order to support the teacher, it is too much for my poor congregation : the consequence is, that very few scholars attend, for the greater part are kept at home, wholly deprived of every kind of instruction, while those who went before, still continue to go to the penny-a-week schools of Protestants. My own regular means of support, after the necessary deduction of servants' wages, taxes, &c. is but the miserable pittance of 43*l.* a year. *I have lain on the bed of sickness, without the means of obtaining a drop of any thing necessary to put to my parched lips, or to raise my drooping spirits.* I have been on the mission a quarter of a century, and have never yet had clothes sufficient to screen me from the winter's blast. I, myself, therefore, can do nothing. I am compelled to lay the forlorn situation of my children before the public, in the hope that some benevolent heart may leave ten or twenty pounds a year, in order to furnish them with that religious and other instruction necessary to make them good *Christians*, and members of society.

"Oct. 23, 1837."

"THOMAS TYSAN."

Although Mr. Tysan very plainly hints that to make a child a Protestant is any thing but to make him a Christian, we do not doubt that had he made his wants known to the Protestants of Sedgley, he might have found something like true christian sympathy, although perhaps they might not have witnessed with the same horror the direful calamity of poor children going to a Protestant penny-a-week school.

It appears that Cardinal Weld has had the good fortune to escape purgatory ! In p. 86 of the Directory, it is stated that "his last breath being drawn, his soul *arose to heaven*, amidst the sighs and prayers of his dearest ones."

This is one of the numerous instances in which the Romanists take the liberty of infringing upon their faith, to exalt the names of such as have signalized themselves by zeal in their service ! a liberty upon any principle nothing less than profane.

R.

THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.—No. I.

THE doctrine of the Apostolical Succession of the Christian Ministry is most usually met, in the present day, by banter and ridicule on the one hand, or by abuse and invective on the other ; and its opponents, in profound ignorance of the several bearings of the subject, seem to treat it as if it were peculiarly a doctrine of Popish origin, fostered and cherished only by certain of the Clergy in the Church, who are fond of *overstraining* her doctrines and principles up to a very near resemblance to those of the Romish communion. It is assumed, that such are the men who have been known by the name of High Churchmen in every generation, from the Reformation downwards ; that they have misrepresented the principles of the Church of England as by law established, and that in this point especially, they have gone so far as to be utterly in opposition to what is understood by the word Protestantism.

But what shall be said as to the accuracy of such opponents of this doctrine, when the very reverse to their assumption is the truth ? For

not only is not this a peculiar opinion or dogma of the Romish Church, but it is the doctrine of the Presbyterians and Congregationalists; nay, with the single exception of the Quakers, it is a doctrine which pervades every sect among professing Christians in existence, which we have ever heard of.

For the proof of the above assertion, which will, perhaps, appear incredible to many, we appeal to the following works recently published, viz. Dr. Russell's "History of the Church in Scotland;" Calvin Colton's "Thoughts on the Religious State of the Country (America);" and Maitland's "Voluntary System."

By the act of parliament of 1690, which established Presbyterianism in Scotland, the succession was most carefully and accurately defined; it was provided that the government of the newly-established Church should be vested in those ministers who were ejected from their livings subsequently to the 1st of January, 1661, and in such other ministers and elders as they had already admitted, or might thereafter admit. Of these deprived incumbents, about sixty were then alive; and as the Government thus did not either by its own authority originate a new line of ministry, or suffer the people to invest men of their own choice with the office, but only pointed out to what class of existing ministers the right of ordaining and perpetuating a succession belonged, we suppose no one will dispute that here is a remarkable fact admitting the existence of some sort of succession in the christian ministry. At that time, indeed, there were other ejected Presbyterian ministers in Scotland; but for reasons of State, the succession was legally assumed to exist in the above body alone; and, as they were the more violent adherents to Presbyterianism, who had formed a schism from their own Church previously, as not sufficiently pure, the Government had ample reason, at a subsequent period, to regret the step it had taken, but could not recall the act. Now, here is surely as ample admission of a succession, as in the case of Queen Elizabeth calling over the ejected Protestant bishops from the continent, in order to perpetuate the English line of Episcopal succession. But we suppose that the case of Scotch Presbyterian ordination rests so clearly on the idea of a succession, as every one who reads the standards of the doctrines of the Scottish Establishment must admit, that it is useless to prove the point. The ignorance of the declaimers against all such succession is, however, most remarkable in speaking of it as a Popish or High-church principle alone.

Whatever might have been the original opinions and principles of the English Independents, Mr. Maitland clearly proves that in the present day, their acknowledged ministry rests on the notion of a succession. Not only do they admit the distinction between minister and layman; but, although laymen may preach, and perform other duties of a religious nature, yet the power of administering the sacraments, and the right of ordaining men to the office, is rigidly confined to ministers who have been themselves thus ordained by other ministers. We cannot, of course, undertake to say that these rules are never infringed or neglected among the multitude of sects into which the English Dissenters are divided, which hardly acknowledge any one common standard of doctrine or church-government; but such is the general and acknow-

ledged practice, and which, surely, in the absence of any professed standard of faith, must be considered as the best evidence of their opinions. With respect to America, Mr. Colton shows clearly that the idea of a *succession* is equally entertained by the Presbyterians and Congregationalists; and that the latter have adopted the high notions of the ministerial character and office which are held by the Presbyterians, and, therefore, go very far beyond the English Dissenters in these matters, although a true Presbyterian will not allow of the validity of the ordinations of the other sect; whence follows this curious corollary, which we give in his own words: "If it be admitted that Presbyterian ordination is valid, and Congregational not, the former in the United States is to a considerable extent vitiated by the fact, that Presbyteries have been erected and composed of Congregational ministers, if not exclusively, yet principally; so that it may have happened, and in all probability has happened, that ministers imposing hands, as Presbyterians, for Presbyterian ordination, were every one of them ordained as Congregationalists. Though I cannot affirm, yet I suspect that such was the case in my own ordination by the Presbytery of Niagara in 1817."—(Note, page 34.)

We think that by showing the opinion and principle of succession in the ministerial office, to be one which is not peculiar to Popery or High Churchmen alone, but one pervading every sect which bears the name of Protestant, we have cleared the way for its more general reception. Once let us admit the notion of a *succession*, and we are immediately committed to the necessity of tracing the links of the chain up to its original, and the authority of those who originated it. The Dissenters wish to claim the authority of the ministerial office for their societies, but shrink from an investigation into the evidences of the source from whence such a claim can be substantiated. After all, however, the real question as between them and ourselves is *this*; shall every man, who thinks himself qualified, or who can gain the approbation of half a dozen others to his assumption of the office, be thereby vested with the right and authority of administering the sacraments, and of keeping up the *visible* Church of Christ by the admission of men to a participation in them? If, as the Dissenters do, we once admit the distinction between minister and layman, we are bound to define in what the distinction exists; and then the validity of *their* ordinations, by which, in practice at least, this authority is conferred among them, comes into discussion. Out of this discussion they can only escape, by an acknowledgment that their ordinations are a mere nullity; that they confer no spiritual authority and power. If a mere *recognition* of the pastoral relation between a minister and his flock be all that is intended, why should the power of ordination be confined to acknowledged ministers from other congregations, who, on the *principles of Independency*, can have no right of interference with other churches? If this be all intended by a Dissenting ordination, the people of the congregation ought themselves to ordain their minister; as otherwise they acknowledge that there is not a full power of spiritual authority among themselves, which is directly opposed to their principles.

CHURCH SOCIETIES.

MR. EDITOR,—In the paper respecting Church Societies, which you did me the favour to make public in the REMEMBRANCE for February, I remarked in effect “that the spirit of charity infused by devout attendance in holy places, and upon divine ordinances, ought on no account to be suffered either to misdirect itself, or to grow cold and languid for want of encouragement and proper guidance; and that a large share of error on one hand, and of indifference on the other, might fairly be attributed to an insufficient practical attention to these two particulars.” In reference to the same subject, I beg to send you an extract from the conclusion of Mr. Le Bas’s Life of Archbishop Laud, which eloquently and forcibly points out the course which, under present circumstances, it becomes Churchmen to pursue. The extract is an elaborate one, but as the force of the argument would be weakened by curtailment, I hope you will be able to make room for it.

“But can the Church itself be preserved? the Church, considered as a great national institution, with all the rightful precedency and honour which, in that character, belong to it. And, when we are considering this tremendous question, it cannot, surely, escape our observation, that there is, at this day, a spirit on the wing, which is ready to combine itself, either with Popery, or with Dissent, in all its manifold varieties;—with any society, in short, or with any interest, which may be supposed to contain, within itself, the seeds of discontent or disaffection. It is a spirit which is ready to become all things to all men. To the Nonconformist, it will become as a Nonconformist: to the Romanist, it will become as a Romanist. To the weak, it will become as weak; and will use the accents of candour and of moderation. To the daring, it will show itself full of hardihood and strength; and will speak openly of the things which pertain to anarchy and demolition. Its secret object is, to banish all fear of God, and all reverence for the powers that be. But, nevertheless, it can take the form of an angel of light; and burn, like a seraph, when pointing to the glories of that period, which is to witness the regeneration and the perfection of the human race. It is a spirit, too, which is constantly labouring to enter into the herd, and to possess them: and if it should be suffered, the end would be, that they must be driven down the steep; where, at last, they would struggle and perish.

“Now, it is the rooted conviction of many sober-minded persons, that there is, also, an antagonist spirit abroad, able, and more than able, to encounter this minister of evil; in other words, that there pervades the *general* mass of the British community, a principle of religion broad and deep, which will keep it safe from the assaults and the artifices of the tempter. Let us allow this persuasion to be just. Then there arises the consideration—how is the National Church to demean herself, in order that she may contribute the amplest contingent towards the moral preservation of the empire? And this question involves another; how can the Church labour most hopefully for the preservation of her own life and vigour? How can she best strengthen the things that yet remain unto her? Is she to concentrate her own

powers, and to occupy her own ground, and to do her own work? or is she to descend from her own position, and to learn other tactics than her own, and to carry on the warfare against Popery, or infidelity, or vice, under the banner of what is called our common Protestantism?

"We would gladly hope, that by far the greater portion of her ministers, and the most intelligent of her laity, will be at no loss for a reply to this question. But, still, there seems to hang a sort of fascination over the spectacle of a holy and catholic league, between christian men of every denomination—all banded together as brethren, against the hosts of ungodliness,—all prepared for a charitable oblivion of their subordinate differences,—and all resolved to *know nothing but Christ and him crucified*. There is no man, whose heart is right with God, but must, occasionally, have felt the difficulty of resistance to the power of this majestic vision. But, nevertheless, when we are brought back to the "sober certainty" of our waking thoughts, the question will intrude itself,—whether this vision ever can be realized, without a virtual surrender of every thing that constitutes the life and essence of a national and Protestant catholic church? whether the peculiar efficacy of such an establishment must not be lost, from the moment when it consents to number itself merely among the multitude of sects, which form the extended line of the Protestant battle? and whether the day on which it abdicates its apostolic post of honour would not, likewise, be the day, from which might be dated the decay of its influence and power, as the grand conservative element of our social system? We might go still further than this,—and ask, whether the Protestant cause would not, in the end, be fatally weakened and endangered, throughout its whole length and breadth, by such a compromise on the part of the Church of England?

"We regret that our space forbids us to work out these thoughts to their conclusion; because it is much to be feared that those conclusions are by no means so familiar as might be desired, to many of the most active members of the Church. And, if this fear be just, we would beseech of our brethren to keep in mind, what are the views, and what the persuasions, of those very parties, in whose alliance they are seeking an accession to their strength? Are they aware, or are they not, that the same spirit which once animated the Puritanical body, and impelled it to the destruction of the hierarchy, has transmigrated, through successive generations, into the ultra-Protestant body of the present day? Are they aware, or are they not, that among the men who are calling loudly for a promiscuous array of the whole Protestant levy, against the thickening force of Popery, there are numbers who stigmatize episcopacy as a remnant of popish imposture and corruption; and who denounce the Clergy of the Establishment, as little better, for the most part, than traitors to the principles of the Reformation? Are they aware, or are they not, that the clamour which brought Laud to the scaffold, is, even now, vehement and fierce against that very cause for which Laud counted not his life dear unto him? If they are aware of these things, and yet are impatient for catholic coalition and confederacy, nothing is left for us but to pray that they may be brought to a safer and a better mind. If they are not aware of them, then let them give their days and nights to the study of those annals which record

the temporary predominance of the ultra-Protestant principle in these realms; and let them read there the perils of a treaty, offensive and defensive, with it. Let them ponder on the fact, that the parties who then were raving incessantly for the extirpation of Popery, were also the parties who rested not till they had laid the Church in ruins.

"Is it then expedient that the Church should at any time be backward in coming to the rescue of the truth when threatened by the onset of heresy or superstition?—No—not so. But it is expedient,—nay, it is absolutely needful,—that she should fight her own battle with her own forces, and according to her own discipline. Let others be left to prosecute the warfare with the weapons, and the strategy, and the scheme of operation to which they may be most accustomed; and let every impression made by them upon the ranks of any common foe, be cheered by her with generous acclamation. But let *her* columns be compact together, with her own men,—with men of deliberate 'valour and fixed thought,'—with men 'strong and skilful to their strength.' With this solid mass, let her be prepared to march calmly onward in legionary power and majesty; and, if need be, into the very heart of her enemy's camp: but, if she once shall merge herself in a miscellaneous, irregular, tumultuary force, her strength will be dissipated and gone, and her glory will be lost—and it may be well if she is not trampled down beneath the feet of her allies in the throng and fury of the assault.

"In the meantime, we would invoke whatever there is yet among us of constancy, of virtue, and of devotion, to guard the sacred fire which burns upon her altar. We would call on those who name themselves the friends, the protectors, the children of the Church, as they value the safety and grandeur of their country, to see that the sanctuary be kept from dishonour,—to labour that our Zion may be 'an eternal excellency,' and 'a joy of many generations.' If they would pray and travail for the prosperity of Jerusalem, that 'peace may be within her walls, and plenteousness within her palaces,' let them remember, that it is mainly 'for the sake of the house of the Lord that they should seek her good;' that her chiefest glory is, that to her the nations of the world are looking up, as to the fortress, in which is deposited 'the ark of the testimony of Israel;' and that if this glory should depart from her, 'the abomination which maketh desolate' will probably be nigh at hand."

Now, in order that the "Church may concentrate her *own powers*, occupy her *own ground*, do her *own work*, fight her *own battles*, with her *own forces*, and according to her *own discipline*," her members must gather themselves together, and each one must consider her cause as his own, and be ready to do his utmost to advance it. In the SOCIETIES FOR BUILDING AND ENLARGING CHURCHES, PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE, AND PROPAGATING THE GOSPEL,—many of her sons—and none but her sons—are already enlisted. It is needful, however, for very many more to range themselves under the same banner, before the Societies can be enabled to render to the full the many important services of which the Church stands in need. I would, therefore, direct special attention to the above sagacious and solemn observations; and connecting, as we cannot but do, the present position and exigencies of

the Church, with the offers of service which her Societies make, I feel extremely anxious that means should be used to render the latter as availing as possible, by concentrating in them the energetic efforts of all the members of the Church. And to this end nothing more is necessary, than the general institution of District Associations, and the fanning the flame of christian charity by a frequent recommendation of the Societies from the pulpit. X.

ON THE HOLY COMMUNION.—ALMS, OBLATIONS.

MR. EDITOR,—The following observations, in reference to certain usages now in vogue in the course of the administration of the Holy Communion, seem deserving of attention at the present moment; they are taken from an old work, by the Rev. WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, entitled, "The Eucharist," &c.

"We may as well notice here, that the gifts of the people consisted, in primitive times, not of money, but of those fruits of the earth which each man's situation in the world enabled him to offer,—more particularly wine, grapes, corn, and bread. Out of this the priest selected such a portion as he thought necessary for the elements of the Sacrament, and the rest was set aside for those charitable purposes above-mentioned.* We must attend to this, because there is now a careless and erroneous custom in many of our churches, of placing the bread and wine upon the Lord's table before the commencement of the service, and by the hands of laymen, the clerk or the churchwarden; whereas, the whole intention and spiritual meaning of the oblation is this:—The people make an offering to God, and out of that offering a portion is selected by the minister to be laid upon the altar for the purpose of the Sacrament. The priest, therefore, having received it from the people, should lay it upon the altar with his own hands, as sanctifying the gift in the sight both of God and of the congregation. For it should always be remembered, that the bread and wine consecrated for the Sacrament are the offerings or oblations of the people. And this precisely meets the expression in the prayer which follows, for no sooner are the alms collected than the minister offers a prayer for the *acceptance* of the *alms*, and to the word *alms*, he adds *oblations*.

"Without an oblation there can be no sacrifice, there can be no prayer or thanksgiving, or any of the parts which constitute the sacrificial nature of the covenant. Not only, therefore, is it necessary that the people should make the offering, but that the priest, and *he alone*, should present it *for them* to God. But it is the custom in most churches for the sacred elements to be placed on the altar *before the commencement of service*, and by this the beauty and design of the whole ceremony is lost.

* Namely, for the support of the Clergy, where requisite, and for the relief of the poor, &c.

"In the Greek Church, as we read in St. Chrysostom, A.D. 398, there was always placed within the rails a side table, where the elements lay until the time of communion. And Nicholls says upon this,— 'Though our Church has not ordered any particular prayer for this action of the priest (the offering of the gifts,) he ought not to neglect the action itself, nor suffer it to be done by any other than himself. And since the Rubric has not authorized the setting of a side table, the priest must be content either himself to go into the vestry to fetch the elements, or he must receive them at the hands of the deacon or clerk, and then place them on the table,—for place them there he must, and no one else.'* And the Rubric emphatically directs,—'The priest shall *then* (after the collection of the alms) place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient.' Here the *time* and the *person* are distinctly appointed.—'Therefore I cannot imagine,' continues Nicholls, 'how so bold an innovation has obtained, for the bread and wine to be placed on the Lord's table by churchwardens, clerks, sextons, or any beside the person whom the Church has obliged to do it.' (*Nicholl's Commentary. Book of Common Prayer.*)

"Mede speaks in like manner:—'It were much to be wished that this were more solemnly done than is usual; namely, not until the time of administration, and by the hand of the minister, in the name and in the sight of the congregation, standing up and showing some sign of due and lowly reverence.' (*Mede's Works*, p. 376.)

"Now the expression *alms* (in our own service) will refer to the money collected for charitable purposes, while the word *oblations* will refer precisely to those offerings of bread and wine laid upon the altar as God's 'creatures,' offered to himself from his people, through the hands of his minister; and which, when consecrated by prayer, are to represent the body and the blood of Jesus Christ."

With these observations before us, we may justly ask, What course ought we to pursue on this point? Should we leave the elements in the keeping of the churchwardens,—the accredited representatives of the people, whose oblations they are,†—until after the alms have been collected, and then receive them at their hands, and place them on the Lord's table?

I am, yours truly,

E.

* If the Rubric does not give its authority for the use of a sidetable, is there any thing said which can be construed to forbid it? If the elements are not to be placed on the Lord's table previously to a certain period in the service, where are they to stand till that time?—Surely there should be some appropriate place for them.—*Transcriber.*

† I cannot forbear adding the remark, how totally the notion entertained in the late Bill respecting Church Rates, proposing to make the Parson provide the elements, would destroy the beautiful and primitive idea of the oblations or offerings of the people. And little, alas! are persons now, though professing themselves members of the Church, aware of the principles on which her practice is founded!

LAW REPORT.

No. LIII.—THE HOME MISSION.

The Rev. ARTHUR ELLIS, Promoter of the Office of the Judge of the Consistory Court of Armagh, Promovent; the Rev. EDWARD NIXON, Impugnant.

ON Wednesday, the 28th of March, judgment was given by the Surrogate, Dr. Miller, in this case. As involving the question of the lawfulness and expediency of the Home Mission, which has been a few years in operation in Ireland, it is peculiarly interesting. We subjoin a copy of the Judgment, with which we have been kindly favoured.

"This is a cause of discipline, in which the Rev. Arthur Ellis, incumbent of the parish of Ardee, is promovent, and the Rev. Edward Nixon is impugnant. The former has complained that the latter, who is a beneficed clergyman in the diocese of Meath, came into his parish of Ardee, in the diocese of Armagh, and there, having posted a placard, announcing his intention of preaching in the market house of Ardee, under the direction of the Home Mission, did persist in preaching, notwithstanding that the promovent had protested against the proceeding in a personal interview with the impugnant. A requisition was accordingly issued to the Bishop of Meath, requesting his assistance in citing to this Court the person so charged, which was afforded, and the impugnant attended here, but under a protestation against the jurisdiction of this Court, as he was, at the time of the alleged offence, a beneficed clergyman of the diocese of Meath, and consequently, as he pleaded, not amenable to the Consistorial Court of Armagh. The protest having been overruled, an appeal was carried to the High Court of Delegates, before which the question of jurisdiction was solemnly argued, and it was decided by that Court, that the act charged was an offence against the authority of the Ordinary of the diocese in which it was alleged to have occurred, and that the person against whom it was so charged was therefore bound to answer before his Court for his conduct.

The original cause having been remitted to this Court, to be tried upon its merits, has been accordingly resumed; and the facts alleged by the promovent having been admitted by the impugnant, it is now my duty to pronounce the judgment of the Court. If it were a simple case of the intrusion of one Clergyman into the benefice of another, in which he persisted in preaching in a place not licensed for divine worship, I should only have to cite the canon which I might conceive to be violated by such conduct, and to apply it for the correction of the offender. But the present cause involves a consideration of far greater importance than that of the conduct of an individual minister, for it is especially important as it may tend to determine whether a certain society, denominating itself the Established Church Home Mission, has a right to send its preachers into every diocese and every parish in Ireland, to preach with the consent of the incumbent or his curate, if it may be obtained, or without it if it should be withheld, and, in the latter case especially, though commonly also in the former, in some other place than the church of the parish. The cause here at issue belongs to the latter part of the alternative; but it may be satisfactory, in this first trial of such a question, to consider it in both its aspects, and thus to endeavour to communicate generally a correct conception of a system, in the maintenance of which, I am well aware, many seriously religious persons believe the interests of religion to be vitally concerned, while others, not less entitled to regard, apprehend from its consequences destructive of that very establishment, of which it professes to be a devoted and valuable auxiliary. I, for my own part, have approached the question with much solicitude, for I fully appreciate its importance. I

have accordingly, bestowed upon it all the consideration in my power, and I trust that I have collected my conclusions from well-examined and sound principles.

A persuasion has been for some time entertained, that every incumbent of a benefice, and, for the like reason, every curate, in the absence of the incumbent, possesses the dominion of his own pulpit so absolutely and exclusively, that the ordinary of the diocese, when he examines the book containing the names of the preachers, has a right only of inquiring whether they were all regularly ordained ministers of the Established Church. If this persuasion be well-authorized all discussion of the former part of the question is precluded, provided that the missionary should choose, as indeed is rarely done, to preach in the church. The preachers of the Home Mission, if they had obtained the consent of the incumbent or curate, might freely preach in his church, or any other regularly ordained ministers, whom he might choose to permit, might preach there, and could be required only to produce their letters of ordination in proof of qualification.

It was once deemed to belong to the freedom of the pulpit, that the minister should be allowed to address his admonitions personally to any individual of his congregation, reminding him particularly of his duties, and animadverting upon and censuring his actions. This notion of the freedom of the pulpit was however found to be in practice offensive and mischievous, and was gradually abandoned. We may say of it, as the Latin poet says on a different subject, *grave virus munditie pepulere*. It is now contended only that the preacher may be changed, indefinitely, at the discretion of the incumbent or curate, without making any reference to his ecclesiastical superior, and with no other limitation than that the stranger should have been regularly ordained. It is obvious that such a liberty might be extended so far as to render the local charge of a particular congregation, and the license of a Bishop committing it to an individual, little more than empty forms. Yet, if it be a matter of strict and

absolute right, how can it be restrained? I freely admit, indeed, that the occasional assistance which Clergymen mutually afford in cases of necessity, and even an occasional interchange of duty for mere convenience, both which have been long practised without reprehension, are not only demanded for the accommodation of ministers, but even beneficial to their congregations, who, in the one case, might else be deprived of the benefit of divine service, and even in the other may derive some advantage from the opportunity of hearing a variety of preachers. This practice, as it has heretofore prevailed, I am far from wishing to abridge. But the present question does not relate to a practice restrained within the limits of necessity, or of occasional convenience. It concerns a claim of an abstract right, which if it exists at all, may be pushed to an extent excluding almost all subordination to ecclesiastical authority, because admitting an indefinite change of ministers, and thus even suspending altogether the express direction of the ninth of the Irish canons, which requires that an incumbent should personally discharge his duty, by preaching on every Sunday to his own congregation.

In support of this pretension, reliance appears to have been chiefly placed on the judgment pronounced by Sir John Nicholl, in the case of *Gates v. Chambers*, in the Arches Court of Canterbury, in the year 1824. But what was this case, as reported in 2. Addams? It was that of a single performance of duty by a curate of the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry, at the request of the rector of a parish in the neighbouring diocese of Peterborough, then absent in attendance upon a sick wife. The judge, in disposing of this case, said, "that occasional assistance so given is punishable as an ecclesiastical offence, merely because the minister so assistant, has not been licensed, as *Curate*, by the Bishop of the diocese, is more than, without further consideration, and other authorities being adduced, I am prepared to lay down as the rule of law: such a rule would be highly inconvenient to the Clergy, and might not unfrequently occasion

parishioners to be deprived altogether of the church service." The case, therefore, was one of urgent necessity, which appeared to have occurred only in a solitary instance; and the judge appears rather to have dismissed the complaint on a consideration of the inconvenience which the strict enforcement of the law would impose both upon the Clergy and upon their parishioners, than to have pronounced that it was adverse to the acknowledged law of the Church. He indeed added, speaking of general licenses to preach, "it is well known that such (separate) licenses to preach were in use both before and for some time after the Reformation: but, for the last century or two, in consequence of the Clergy being better educated, or for some other reason, they have fallen into *desuetude*, and are now included either in letters of orders, or in the licenses of ministers to particular cures." Of these licenses I shall speak presently, for they have been pressed into the service of the Home Mission. I shall now only remark, that Sir John Nicholl has left their actual bearing undecided, not having pronounced whether they are now included in letters of orders, or in the licenses of ministers to particular cures. All that he has positively pronounced is, which is notorious, that for the last century or two they have fallen into *desuetude*. What had been substituted for them, he appears to have been unable to satisfy himself.

Another authority has also been adduced in this case of the Home Mission, which is entitled to much respect, being understood to be an opinion given by Dr. Phillimore two years afterwards. "I apprehend," says this opinion, as reported in *The Christian Observer* for March, 1836, "that a Bishop has no authority to prevent any incumbent, within his diocese, from admitting into the pulpit of his church, any regularly ordained minister of the Established Church not resident within his diocese, from preaching an occasional sermon in any church within his diocese, provided he has the sanction of the incumbent of that church for so doing." Nor am I disposed to dissent from

this opinion, if by an occasional sermon be understood only a sermon preached in the course of that reciprocal accommodation which the Parochial Clergy have long been in the habit of giving and receiving, and the Bishops of allowing. In this sense only the civilian appears to have used the words; and yet the opinion cannot be applied to the present question, unless they may be understood to have been used in a much larger acceptance. For his application of the words, the author of the opinion has not adduced any other authority than the past usage of the Church, and therefore they cannot be extended beyond that usage. "Undoubtedly," he adds, "it appears from the canons of 1603, and other authorities, that in former times no person could preach, unless he had a specific license for that purpose: but this regulation has long ago become obsolete. The letters of orders have been considered as superseding the necessity for such a license; and it is now the established usage (a usage which could not, in my judgment, be controverted with effect) that any Clergyman may be allowed to preach an occasional sermon, on exhibiting his letters of orders." It is thus acknowledged that the alleged right has no foundation in the canons, or other orders of the Church, but rests wholly upon usage. So far, therefore, as that usage has been admitted, it may be considered as sanctioned; but this sanction extends no further than the claim of reciprocal convenience, or, as is stated in the opinion itself, than the act of preaching an occasional sermon. The opinion, indeed, is probably founded on the previous decision of Sir John Nicholl, and I have shown how far that may be considered as extending.

The true liberty of the pulpit, which I am far from impeaching, consists, I conceive, in something wholly distinct both from the offensive personality of the older preachers, and from the arbitrary and uncontrolled right of exchanging or transferring duty, claimed by those of the present time. My conception of it I cannot better illustrate than by comparing it with the liberty of the press; and I sup-

pose that the most eager advocate of clerical freedom might be satisfied, if they should be shown to be strictly analogous, unless, indeed, he had some special reason in justifying his own conduct, for rejecting my description of it. The liberty of the press consists, I apprehend, in an entire exemption from control previous to publication, the work published becoming, however, then subject to the prescriptions of the known laws of the land. The liberty of the pulpit consists, I conceive, in a similar exemption from all control previous to the act of preaching; the sermon, however, when delivered, becoming then subject to the prescriptions of the known laws of the church. Attempts have been made, doubtless, from the best and purest motives, by individual Bishops of both countries, to impose on their Clergy some more specific restrictions in regard to doctrines which are thought to be ambiguously, or at least indistinctly, determined in the Articles. These attempts have been successfully resisted, and it was right that they should be opposed as invasions of the liberty of the pulpit, because individual Bishops are not competent to narrow the limits of doctrine prescribed by the public authority of the Church. The preacher should go into the pulpit free to preach the Gospel of CHRIST, in correspondence only to the Articles to which he was bound at his ordination. This is the true independence of the pulpit; not a liberty which would almost supersede all superintendence, by an indefinite change of the individuals to be controlled.

Nor is the consideration of this liberty of indefinite change of ministers the only, or the principal one, belonging to the present question, for it is still to be considered how the discipline of the Church is affected, when the change of ministers, instead of being casual and arbitrary, is the result of the organized administration of a self-constituted society, which has distributed the whole country into numerous and formally arranged circuits, as if for the regular administration of the law of the land, and sends about its preachers according

to a systematic and orderly plan of operations. And here it is important to remark, that the very same action may bear a very different character, as it is the occasional act of an individual, or the result of a combined and organized system, inasmuch that in the one case it might be wholly innocent, and even rightful or expedient, in the other mischievous and reprehensible. Of this remark a satisfactory illustration may be derived from the Convention Act, passed in this country, in the thirty-third year of George III., by which it was enacted, that the exercise of the unquestioned right of petitioning the King or the Parliament, should be deemed a misdemeanour, if it should be the act of an assembly affecting to represent the people, other than the Parliament or the Convocation. What was the principle of this enactment? That this mode of exercising an acknowledged right constituted an usurpation of a representative character, belonging only to the Parliament or to the Convocation. It appears, therefore, that, in the contemplation of the legislature, the character of an action might be so changed by circumstances, constituting it an usurpation of legitimate authority, as to render it deserving of punishment, however justifiable in different circumstances. By parity of reasoning, we may conclude that, however allowable and even beneficial may be the practice of interchanging ecclesiastical duty, or of affording assistance in the occasional discharge of ministerial offices, it may not afford any sanction to the proceedings of a self-constituted society, assuming the title of the committee of the Home Mission, and conducting its operations by a systematic and orderly organization. What we have in this case to consider is whether the connexion of the act of the impugnant with the organization and systematic arrangement of the Home Mission, as announced by the placard giving notice of his sermon, invested it with a character of usurped authority, which, by a fair analogy of construction, should except it from the general indulgence allowed to occasional interchanges of duty, and render

it a fit subject of ecclesiastical animadversion and punishment.

The ecclesiastical law of these countries seems not to have been yet sufficiently examined in relation to this subject. It is known, as Sir John Nicholl remarked in his judgment, that in the early period of our Protestant Church licenses were issued, authorizing certain persons to preach at large, without regard to parochial limitations, and it has been vaguely supposed that letters of orders have succeeded to, and taken the place of these licenses, conveying an authority as little restrained within the limits of local ministrations. An accurate consideration of this part of the question must, I conceive, lead to a very different conclusion.

The first mention of licenses for preaching in the Church of England, subsequent to the reformation of the Church, occurs in the very commencement of the reign of Edward VI., when the most eminent preachers were selected to accompany visitors sent throughout England by a royal commission, and the parochial clergy were required to admit no man to preach within their cures except such only as should have been licensed thereunto by the King, the Protector, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York in his province, or the Bishop of the diocese. An injunction of a similar import was in the year 1559 issued by Elizabeth, the Queen's visitors being substituted for the Protector; and another is contained in certain canons issued in the year 1571. In the canons, however, of the year 1603, which constitute the peculiar law of the Clergy of the Church of England, no mention is found of any license issued by the sovereign, or by any Archbishop, so that licenses for preaching appear to have been then confined to those which were issued by a Bishop for supplying, within his own diocese, the still existing deficiency of qualified preachers.

The canons of the year 1603 appear, moreover, to have provided in two particulars for a transition to a purely local ministrations, in which every minister, without the aid of itinerant preachers, should discharge

the duties of his own cure. By the forty-sixth canon every beneficed man, not admitted to preach, was required to procure at least one sermon in each month, to be preached in his church by a licensed preacher, if the value of the benefice should, in the judgment of the Ordinary, be sufficient to bear it. This regulation seems to have converted a vague itinerancy through a diocese into a stated, though partial assistance; and accordingly we find in the fiftieth canon, that precisely the same authority is required for ministers affording it, as by the forty-eighth is required for ordinary and stationary curates. By the forty-fifth canon, again, a local and very limited itinerancy was allowed, which seems to imply that the more general itinerancy, even of a diocese, had then actually ceased. Every beneficed man, if licensed to be a preacher, was directed to preach on each Sunday, either in his own church or chapel, or in some neighbouring one destitute of a preaching minister. It appears, therefore, that, in the fifty-six years intervening between the injunction of Edward VI. and the canons of James I., the licenses issued by the royal authority for a general itinerancy of preaching, and by the Archbishops for similar progresses through their respective provinces, were discontinued, and that even the diocesan itinerancy was reduced to two very limited cases, that of the successive service of not more than four benefices, and that of an occasional visit of a licensed incumbent of a benefice to some neighbouring church, which happened to be destitute of a preaching minister. In the Act of Uniformity licenses for preaching are still mentioned, but without any reference to itinerancy.

In the Irish canons, issued in the year 1634, or thirty-one years after those of England, even one of these cases of itinerancy has been omitted, for there is no allowance of the occasional attendance of a qualified minister, to preach in a neighbouring church instead of his own. In correspondence to this observation it may be remarked, that the Irish canons do

not contain any direction, requiring, like the fifty-second English canon, that the names of these strangers, who should preach in each church, should be registered in a book for the information of the Bishop. Such a book is now, indeed, very properly required by the Bishops of Ireland, since the practice of occasionally interchanging duty has created a necessity of keeping such a record; but it could not with any reason be required of the Parochial Clergy, so long as every beneficed minister was strictly limited to the performance of his own local duty, the occasional preachers still remaining being rather curates, whose services were divided among two, three, or four benefices, than itinerants. From these omissions it may be further inferred that a licensed itinerancy had at this time ceased also in the Church of England, for the extreme poverty of the Church of Ireland, which was such that the earl of Strafford, the chief governor, represented to Archbishop Laud, in the same year, that six benefices were not able to find the minister clothes, would, I conceive, have recommended an itinerant instead of, or in aid of, a local ministry, which could be supported only by accumulating benefices for the subsistence of a single minister, if itinerancy had not already ceased in the Church of England.

While the canons of the two Churches thus exhibit a gradual transition from a ministry partly local, partly itinerant, to one wholly of the former description, they also contain a provision for the due regulation of a settled ministry in three several injunctions, the common object of all being that order and harmony should be maintained among the Clergy. It is accordingly directed, that no person should be admitted to a Curacy except under a formal license issued by the Bishop; but at the same time, that the ministers engaged in discharging the duties of the same benefice may act in mutual agreement, the selection of the curate is on each vacancy given to the incumbent, so that he should be in every case the object of the choice of his principal. For the more general preservation of harmony among preachers, it is further provided by the fifty-third

English and the tenth Irish canon, that any public opposition between them, either in the same or in neighbouring churches, shall immediately be submitted to the determination of the Bishop. These regulations appear to have done all which could be done, for maintaining at once the controlling authority of the Bishop, and the harmony of the Parochial Clergy. The Bishop alone can authorize the introduction of a curate, but he has been previously selected by the minister, whom he is to assist; and, if unhappily an opposition should arise among preachers, the Bishop is empowered and directed to interpose for calming the dissension.

It is sufficiently apparent that in a system so arranged and combined, there is no room for the intrusive services of an itinerant, which would interfere either with the selection of the incumbents, or with the control of the Diocesan, possibly with both, and might very probably give occasion to an opposition between preachers. I will go further and say that, under both the English and the Irish canons, even a Bishop, in my opinion, is not now authorized to send missionaries through his own Diocese, because he has not the right of sending into any parish an assistant minister, who had not been previously selected by the incumbent, and by him recommended for the approbation of the Diocesan.

These considerations are applicable to the preachers employed in the Home Mission, more especially if, as has been charged and admitted in the present cause, and as I believe was very generally practised, the case should be aggravated by preaching in places not authorized by the discipline of the Church. But as these operations cannot be conducted, except under the direction and superintendence of some Committee, however constituted, I am anxious to point out to the consideration of individuals so associated, the twenty-second of the Irish canons, as meriting their most serious attention. This canon is as follows:—
“Forasmuch as all conventicles and secret meetings of priests and ministers have been ever justly accounted very hurtful to the state of the Church wherein they live: we do now ordain

and constitute, that no priests or ministers of the Word of God, nor any other persons, shall meet together in any private house, or elsewhere, to consult upon any matter or course to be taken by them, or upon their motion or direction by any other, which may any way tend to the impeaching or depraving of the doctrine of the Church of Ireland, or of the book of Common Prayer, or of any part of the government and discipline now established in the Church of Ireland, under pain of excommunication." That the concluding part of the canon, which relates to the government and discipline of the Church, has the bearing which I ascribe to it, in directing to it the attention of the Committee of the Home Mission, is evident from comparing it with the corresponding English canon, and considering the interval of time which had intervened between the two ordinances. The corresponding English canon, which is the seventy-third, agrees with the Irish canon in all particulars, except these words, which accordingly must have been added by Archbishop Laud, in reference to the agitations which the Church of England had experienced from the efforts of the Puritans in the thirty-one years which had elapsed since the English canons were framed. We indeed discover in Carwithen's History of the English Church a remarkable occurrence of that kind, which happening about two years before the formation of the Irish canons probably was the immediate occasion of the addition made to the article, and certainly bears not a little correspondence to the proceedings of the Home Mission of Ireland. "When Preston," says the historian, "was at the head of the Puritans, a project was formed of setting up lectures in market-towns. For this purpose a self-constituted corporation had purchased such impropriations as were in the hands of the laity, for providing a maintenance for a 'constant preaching ministry.' The persons appointed by the corporation as lecturers were generally Nonconformists, many of whom had been suspended by their Ordinaries. Laud saw that this corporation was

'the main instrument of the Puritan faction' to ruin the Church, and the feoffees were prosecuted by the Attorney-General. The feoffments were cancelled in the court of exchequer, and the impropriations confiscated to the crown." Here, as in the Home Mission, we find a self-constituted committee of management, and the same object of maintaining and introducing an intrusive ministration. This earlier plan was defeated by Laud, because the managers had committed the error of affecting to act as a corporation, in acquiring and possessing property; and the Archbishop appears then, in framing canons for the Church of Ireland, to have turned his mind to the enlargement of the English canon, for preventing its recurrence under another and securer form.

It must indeed be admitted that one of the Irish canons, the thirty-ninth, provides for the case of strangers admitted to preach in any parish. But when it is considered that the Irish canons have excluded one of the two cases of strange ministers specified in those of the English Church, together with a regulation requiring that a book should be kept in each parish, for registering the names of such preachers, retaining only that other case, which has been described as rather a case of a divided or partial Curacy, we must consider this only as a provision that the same precaution should be used in receiving such divided or partial services, as in the case of entire and stationary curacies.

The canons, with which the Home Mission has been compared, are not such as might in the changes of society be conceived to have become obsolete, but belong to the very essence of an established Church, being necessary to its combination and efficiency. It having been shown that these afford no sanction to such an association, it remains to inquire whether, as some religious persons have professed to think, there was some manifest deficiency in the actual energies of the Church, which might warrant even an irregular infusion of the zeal and exertion of individuals in aid of its inadequate ministrations. Now what was the time at which the

Protestant Church of Ireland has been thus weighed in the balance and found wanting?

The commencement of the plan of a Home Mission is recorded in the *Christian Examiner*, for December, in the year 1828, as having just then occurred, though six years, I believe, passed before it was matured into its present organization. But this was almost immediately subsequent to a very remarkable secession from the Church of Rome, and if ever there was a time when the Church of Irish Protestants might fairly claim to have proved its efficiency, this was the very time. Fifteen months before this time, the Irish public had been surprised by the announcement of numerous conversions which had just then appeared in the County of Cavan. This was speedily followed by similar communications from many other and distant districts of Ireland, and the secession was actually in progress, though with a diminished velocity, at the very time, as it appears, when an extensive system of itinerant preaching was conceived to be necessary for assisting its too languid efforts. Yet this revulsion of religious opinion among our Roman Catholic countrymen can be traced only to the great and general improvement of the Protestants, both Laity and Clergy, in attending to their religious duties, especially to that of communicating to the young the advantage of a scriptural education.

That most promising reformation of the Roman Catholics was indeed checked and suppressed in its second year; but this was the effect of the violent resistance, which its so successful commencement had excited, not at all of any relaxation of the efforts of the Protestant Clergy. The Clergy of the Roman Catholics were struck with alarm for their own security, as if the ground on which they stood was passing from beneath their feet; to avert the calamity of a general desertion they urged the laity everywhere to press forward for the attainment of a political aggrandizement, which should bind them to their Church as a successful party; and, in the next following year, the hope of a further

extension of religious reformation was lost amidst the triumph of a political equalization, which fixed the selfishness of the wavering, and alarmed the apprehensions of the timorous. Thus did even the early suppression of that incipient reformation bear testimony to its reality and importance, for its adversaries manifested, by their prompt and vehement resistance, how much they feared from its success.

The Home Mission appears, therefore, to have grown out of the religious energy of the Protestant Church, not to have been called into action by the necessity of supporting its weakness. I remember that a very eminent physician once remarked to me, that it was among the maxims, I think, of Hippocrates, that men, when in the enjoyment of full and vigorous health, should be most apprehensive of disease. The maxim seems to have found in this Association a moral illustration. No one questions the religious zeal of the managers of the Home Mission, or of the individual Clergyman, who is the impugnant in the present suit. No one even imputes to any of these persons a disposition unfriendly to the establishment of the Protestant Church, however their efforts may be deemed, and this indeed is by themselves acknowledged to be, adverse to a strict observance of its discipline. The question is only whether their case is not one of irregular and morbid excitement, which has arisen from the full and vigorous health of the ecclesiastical body, but which the preservation of that health may require us to repress.

The operations of the Home Mission, as arranged about four years ago, are superintended by a committee, composed of nineteen clergymen of the Established Church, together with two others acting as secretaries, who distributed the whole of Ireland into twelve circuits, since that time increased to seventeen, through which they direct the periodical progresses of numerous missionaries. This must be acknowledged to be at least a very anomalous appendage of an Established Church. The other orders of the Clergy have been, by the constitution of the Establishment, subjected to the

superintendence and control of the Bishops in their respective districts; but here is a society of Clergymen professing to belong to the Establishment, some actually benefited or otherwise employed in the Church, others not having any engagement in it, who have assumed to themselves a religious superintendence, not merely over a diocese, or over a province, but over the whole country throughout its four provinces—desirous, indeed, of receiving the concurrence and cooperation of the Bishops, but still persisting in their operations notwithstanding the expressed disapprobation of many of their superiors. When our Church is thus at once persecuted by the violence of its adversaries, and embarrassed by the irregular zeal of its friends, it may not be unseasonable to cite the words of Hooker, as they occur in his *Epistle Dedicatory*, wherein he explains his design in composing his memorable vindication of the Church of England. "There are undoubtedly," says he, "more estates overthrown through diseases bred within themselves, than through violence from abroad." "Domestic evils," he adds, "for that we think we can master them at all times, are often permitted to run on forward, till it be too late to recall them. In the meanwhile the commonwealth is not only through unsoundness so far impaired, as those evils chance to prevail, but further also through opposition arising between the unsound parts and the sound, where each endeavours to draw evermore contrary ways, till destruction in the end brings the whole to ruin."

The anomaly was not suffered to pass without episcopal animadversion. In the very same year in which it was matured to its actual state, it became a subject of two charges, one delivered by the late Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, the other by the present Bishop of Down and Connor. The latter of these drew forth a copious and ardent reply from a member of the committee, the Rev. Robert J. M'Gee, to which, in my respect for its able and distinguished author, I think it necessary to advert; conceiving that no other person could be more competent to vindicate the proceedings

of the Association. This apologist has ventured to contend that the authority to preach, conferred at the ordination of a minister, was a general commission, which no Bishop had a right to restrain. It seems strange, indeed, that this position should have been maintained in replying to a charge in which had been collected and stated the numerous passages of the ordination services, both of deacons and priests, which expressly limit the authority so conferred to a local ministration. In the form prescribed for ordaining a deacon, special mention is made of reading the Scriptures unto the people assembled in the church where he shall be appointed to serve; of his duty to preach, if he be admitted thereto by the Bishop; of his office to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish; of the reverend obedience promised to his Ordinary; of the authority given him to read the Gospel in the Church of God, and to preach the same, if he be thereunto licensed by the Bishop himself. In the form for ordaining priests we find like mention of their duty to such as are, or shall be, committed to their charge; of instructing the people committed to their charge out of the Holy Scriptures; of teaching the people committed to their cure and charge; of using monitions and exhortations to the sick and to the whole within their cures; of maintaining and setting forward quietness, especially among them that are, or shall be, committed to their charge; of reverend obedience and submission to their Ordinary and other chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over them; of the prayer for the benefit of them over whom they shall be appointed God's ministers, and, most particularly, of the authority given them to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments, in the congregation, where they shall be lawfully appointed thereunto. It seems scarcely possible that language should define more precisely a local ministration, subject to the control of a diocesan.

The apologist, however, in effect admits, that this Society acts in violation of the discipline of the Church,

and attempts to justify the violation. "Questions of discipline and order," says he, "are useful and important in their place; but they are not the questions that concern the Church of England at this time." "It is not, my Lord," he adds, "whether we shall maintain the regularity of discipline, but whether we shall have any discipline to maintain—not how far Bishops may, or may not, assert their jurisdiction, but whether there will be any jurisdiction to assert, or any Bishops to assert it—not how far ministers are to preserve discipline, real, or alleged, in preaching or not preaching, in one another's parishes, but whether they shall have any parishes to preach in, or whether there shall be any ministers to preach. These are the questions, my Lord, to occupy the Bishops and the Clergy of Ireland."

But if the Church of Ireland be indeed exposed to danger, thus imminent, can it be wise to throw off all the bonds of discipline, and to trust for safety and deliverance to the uncontrolled energies of excited individuals? Let not the Home Mission imagine that, when discipline shall have been cast aside, as cumbrous and inconvenient, all zeal will be confined to themselves, and be directed only as they may think it usefully employed. In the general dissolution of discipline, other Missions, not less zealous, may encounter them in the field of controversy, and the last struggle of the Protestant Church of Ireland might too nearly resemble the last hours of the Jewish Church of Jerusalem, in which contending sects were striving for pre-eminence, while their enemies were at their gates, or that crisis of the Greek Christians, in which the miserable polemics were disputing whether the light manifested on Mount Tabor, at the transfiguration, was created or uncreated, while the adversaries of Christianity were advancing to the conquest of the capital and the subjugation of the Church.

For the aggravated irregularity of preaching in unlicensed places, with which the impugnant in the present suit is charged, it is pleaded that by preaching in other places than those appointed for regular congregations,

the missionaries might best hope to draw Socinians and Roman Catholics to listen to their instructions. This may be true, though probably not to any considerable extent; and we know that, in regard to the latter description of persons, the Society admit their failure, for within the last year their secretary publicly acknowledged in Cork, that the Roman-catholic part of the population had not then been reached. But I learn from the eloquent apologist himself that another and a nearer object than proselyting Socinians and Romanists has been proposed. "If," says he, "the parochial minister should unfortunately happen to be careless and regardless of his flock, surely your lordship," addressing still the Bishop of Down and Connor, "does not intend to call it an evil, that the Protestant members of a congregation should hear a missionary preacher, lest they might undervalue the care of a pastor, whom on this hypothesis, it is impossible they could regard. Surely it ought rather to be called a good, not only that the people should receive some benefit, but that, under the divine blessing, perhaps the pastor might be led to a sense of the duty of exertion, and learn to labour both in the word and doctrine himself." Here we find that the reformation of the parochial Clergy of the Established Church itself is contemplated, as an object sufficiently important to justify the missionaries in intruding into their parishes, that they might not only supply their deficiency to their congregations, but also arouse themselves to a more efficient discharge of their ministerial functions. The case described is, however, one of which there must be at this time very few, if any instances; and in these the proper remedy would be an application to the ecclesiastical superior. The case really contemplated by the apologist, and which may indeed not unfrequently occur, seems rather to have been a difference in proclaiming the terms of man's salvation. "Let us suppose," says he, "the missionaries preaching the gospel, and that they preach in parishes where the minister does not preach the gospel,—let us, however reluctantly, assume the hypo-

thesis, that the Clergy, in any diocese, for example, did not preach salvation through Christ, but that they set forth the fundamental error of salvation by man's works." Of this case he disposes by stating that the original practice of the reformed church was to send out men with licenses to preach. But these men were licensed to preach where there was not already any preacher allowed, as qualified, not to correct erroneous doctrine by preaching in opposition to men who were also authorized.

The main ground of our separation from the Church of Rome being our rejection of the Romish doctrine of justification by the merit of works, the case to which the apologist alludes cannot be that a Protestant minister should so far forget the spirit of his ministry as to preach directly and explicitly that man may be saved "by man's works," for this would be to return to the very corruption which his Church has expressly abjured. The case supposed must be one in which this erroneous doctrine is attributed but by inference to the ministers of the Establishment, and can be no other than that in which every person holding the Arminian doctrine is, by the rigid Calvinist, regarded as maintaining that man is saved by the meritorious efficacy of his own performances. There has, indeed, been a time, and within my own remembrance, when the Clergy of the Established Church appeared to think that the essential doctrines of their religion were sufficiently confirmed in the minds of their congregations, and accordingly directed a large portion of their instructions to the exposition and enforcement of the moral duties of a Christian. But the practice of the Church has, in this respect, undergone a considerable change; and its ministers have long been very generally convinced that those doctrines must be held continually in view, and moral duties inculcated only in direct and immediate connexion with the religious motives which they present. The imputation, therefore, of not preaching the gospel, must be now urged only by the Calvinist against the Arminian, who holds indeed that the Almighty, by his

foreknowledge of their conduct, had selected from the beginning the objects of his future favour, offering, however, to all sufficient means of salvation, which they may neglect or resist, but does not hold that any man can, by his natural power, conform to the will of God, or that his best actions, when he has availed himself of the divine assistance, can furnish him with any claim of merit on the divine favour. But I do not sit here to judge of controversy, except so far as it may interfere with and disturb the discipline of the Church. I say not, therefore, that the Calvinist is wrong, or that the Arminian is right; but this I say without hesitation, that I have sought in vain among the rules and orders of the Church, for any direction which might warrant the Calvinist in pleading his doctrine in abatement of a charge of parochial intrusion, for having gone into the parish of an Arminian incumbent, to correct the imputed errors of his opinions; and I know that opposition among preachers is strictly prohibited.

But still the plea remains, that, without the preaching of missionaries, no access can be obtained to the millions of our people belonging to the Church of Rome. I agree with the apologist in considering the duties of a Protestant minister as embracing all such inhabitants of his parish, so far as any fair opportunity may be allowed him. But I do not see how this admission will warrant the irregular services of the missionary. Is it already forgotten, that before the Home Mission began its operations, a very considerable and very general impression had been made upon the numbers and stability of the Romish Church in Ireland? Is it already forgotten that, only nine years before the Apology was given to the public, a new reformation, by a sort of spontaneous combustion, broke out first in Cavan, and then, by a rapid succession, in numerous other places throughout the country, though with a less concentrated vigour? When a pure form of Christianity has been established in a country, when preachers have been distributed through all its districts, and congregations have been regularly

formed, the most persuasive method of addressing the members of a different Church seems rather to be to endeavour to render those professing a purer faith so exemplary in christian seriousness and piety as to present living arguments of its genuineness and truth.

How much, indeed, can be effected in religious reformation without the publicity of placards, and the exciting novelty of a missionary preacher, by the prevailing example of a holy life, and the persuasive, because personal and friendly admonitions of occasional intercourse, we have a memorable example in the venerated Bedell, at whose grave, overwhelmed though he had been by the horrors of a savage and bloody rebellion, a Romish Clergyman was heard to utter the heartfelt aspiration, "May my soul be with Bedell." The apologist, while he quotes this respected authority, remarks that it does not bear directly upon the question of missionary preaching. In this, however, I must differ from him, for it is directly adverse to the system, inasmuch as it indicates, that the duty of a Protestant minister, in regard to his Roman-catholic parishioners, may be faithfully and efficiently discharged, by quietly embracing all opportunities, as they present themselves, according to his proper station, for instructing them in the truths of genuine Christianity. This was what Bedell practised himself, and would alone permit in others. Nor do I agree with this eloquent and zealous man in thinking, that the Protestant Church of Ireland has so failed in its duty to the country, as to deserve to be utterly rejected by the Almighty, if not regenerated by the energies of the Home Mission. In what period of its history has this deficiency been fairly tried? Was it in the short interval of seven years, which intervened between the formation of its canons and a bloody rebellion, in which interval the utmost efforts of Lord Strafford were employed in wresting from powerful men some portion of the property, of which it had been plundered in times of public confusion? Was it in the reign of Charles II., in which the Church was struggling to emerge from the

ruin, in which it had been recently overwhelmed in common with the government? Or was it in the last century, when, having been again ruined by the apostasy of the sovereign, it was barred from all efforts of genuine conversion by the severities of an irritated and triumphant party, until to these severities had succeeded an excessive liberality, which proscribed all controversial discussion as an uncharitable interference? In the present century indeed the Church has been fairly tried. But who will maintain that it has so failed as to be justly pronounced hopelessly incapable? Its adversaries have written their attestation of its efficiency in characters of blood.

That the preaching of the Home Mission has done good in some, perhaps in many instances, I am not disposed to deny. The word of God can hardly be preached in any circumstances without doing some immediate good. But I am bound to consider whether this is not overbalanced by much evil, in the confusion which it introduces into the administrations of the Church, and the disposition to secede from its ordinary and regular offices, which it tends to generate. The people of a parish are taught to look to the periodical visit of the missionary, coming from a distance, and frequently changed, as more exciting than the stated services of the established minister; the invitation to assemble by preference in the school-house, or the market-house, leads them away from a pious reverence of the consecrated place of public worship; the curtailment of the public service, which is, I believe, reduced on these occasions to the recitation of two or three collects, weans them from the admirable liturgy of our Church, which is so accommodated to the expression of all our wants and feelings. Perhaps, too, the doctrine preached by the missionary, however restricted from direct and formal controversy, tends to substitute the narrow zeal of a sect for the liberal devotion of a Christian, and to infuse an opinion, that the authorized tenets of the Church are too general for the precise strictness of religious truth.

When I see a number of zealous men thus eager to intrude their irregular services into the Church, I cannot but call to mind, that the apostle has lamented that disorder was introduced into the primitive Church of Christ by the unseasonable and intemperate display even of preternatural endowments, bestowed for the express purpose of propagating christian doctrine, and felt it necessary to admonish his Corinthian converts, that "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace." Let me then entreat the Clergymen concerned in the Home Mission, either as managers, or as missionaries, to consider seriously with themselves, whether, in disregarding and violating the order of the Church, they are not, however unintentionally, causing more evil than all the good which they could plead would ever compensate; whether they must not be eventually instrumental in tearing down and destroying the noblest and most efficient establishment of the reformed religion, and, in their progress towards this deplorable catastrophe, generating disunion among its ministers, and leading forward the laity in the path of dissent and schism. Let me beseech them to meditate on that exquisite panegyric of law, or regulated order, which was addressed by Hooker to those who, in his day, set at nought the discipline of the Church, and eventually destroyed it. "Of law," says he, "there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power: both angels and men and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent, admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy." It seems as if the venerable advocate of the Establishment, in composing this beautiful passage, had caught a portion of the devotional sublimity even of the Jewish Psalmist.

In conclusion, holding as I do that an organized Association sending preachers, according to its own dis-

cretion, through every district of the Church, is offensive to the superintending authority of its legitimate rulers, and consequently falls under the express prohibition of the twenty-second canon, which denounces against it the penalty even of excommunication; that the intrusion of its preachers, under the pretext of supplying the deficiencies, or of correcting the errors, of parochial ministers, is injurious to the good order and efficiency of the ministrations of the Church; that the irregular excitement caused by the visits of missionaries, by gratifying a taste for something different from the regular offices of the Church, tends to lead the people away from the stated services of the parochial ministers, and thus to encourage and promote dissent and separation; that the practice of preaching, by preference, in places not regularly set apart for the performance of public worship, disposes the people to resort to conventicles, rather than to their churches, and violates the twenty-first canon, under which particularly this suit has been instituted; that the curtailment of the appointed liturgy of the Church, which is customary in the meetings held by the missionaries, is especially injurious, as it teaches the people to neglect that liturgy, and to substitute attendance on a preacher for the humiliation of practical devotion; and that experience has proved that these irregularities, while they are thus prejudicial to the members of our own Church, are of little, if of any efficacy, in impressing with just sentiments of religion those who do not belong to it, whereas it has on the contrary proved, that a very salutary impression may be made, under the ordinary ministrations of the Church, when they are conducted, as they have been, in the brief period in which alone its efficiency has been fairly brought to trial; holding and considering all these things, I feel myself bound to pronounce the impugnant guilty of an offence deserving to be visited with the severe condemnation of this Court.

The charge has been brought under the twenty-first canon, and the punishment prescribed by that canon, for

a first offence, is suspension; for a second, excommunication. The former penalty it is now my duty to impose; but, as the impugnant has, however late, submitted himself to the Court, acknowledging the facts charged against him, and disclaiming any intention of offending against the discipline and government of the Church, I am disposed to treat him with all possible lenity, being willing to believe, that the proceedings which have been instituted, and the inquiries which they have occasioned, may lead not only the impugnant himself, but also other zealous and well-intentioned Clergymen among those in connexion with whom he has acted, to direct their future efforts for the advancement

of religion, in such a manner that they may not clash with the superintending control and regulated order, without which it is impossible that the efficiency of the Established Church should be maintained. I shall therefore only decree a suspension for three weeks, ordering at the same time that, in consideration of the submission of the impugnant, this sentence shall not be certified to the Lord Bishop of Meath, nor any requisition issued for enforcing the execution. The impugnant must, however, pay the costs of this suit.

JACOB BARRETT, Esq. Proctor of Office.

JOHN M'KINSTRY, jun. Esq. Proctor for Impugnant.

POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

DOMESTIC.—Owing to the Easter recess, and the peculiar tact of her Majesty's Ministers, so often shown to consist in evading the difficulty of doing anything, nothing of consequence has occurred since our last notice worth recording, except the very serious falling off in the Revenue, which can now be no longer denied. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is evidently at his wits' end, and hints of resignation have been dropped. As to resignation, however, that is the

last virtue for which we shall give any of the present officials credit. It is also reported that her Majesty's Coronation, which had been fixed by accident for the anniversary of the death of his late Majesty, George IV. has been further postponed. We doubt not that there is, in the original appointment, and the subsequent abandonment of the day, some motives worthy of the high-minded and independent Cabinet of my Lord Melbourne. "*Nous verrons.*"

UNIVERSITY, ECCLESIASTICAL, AND PAROCHIAL INTELLIGENCE.

TRIBUTES OF RESPECT.

THE REV. GEORGE AINSLIE.—The Rev. George Ainslie, M.A., having been presented by Lord Selsey to the Vicarage of Barkway, Hertfordshire, has lately received the following testimony to the respect and regard in which he was universally held by the inhabitants of the parish with which his connexion has just terminated. Having been Minister of St. Peter's District Church, Walworth, in the parish of St. Mary, Newington, in the county of Surrey, for nearly seven years, and for some time previously to that period Curate of the mother church, the congregation of the former, with many other inhabitants of the whole parish, voluntarily came forward (in the words of the original notice of the meeting which was summoned for the purpose), "To consider the most appropriate mode of expressing the high opinion which is universally entertained of the manner in which the Rev. George Ainslie, M.A., has

discharged the duties of his sacred office, during his ministry in the parish." A numerous meeting was the consequence of this notice; who, while they would not withhold their hearty congratulations on his present preferment, still gave many unequivocal proofs of the deep regret with which they contemplated the termination of their connexion with one, for whom such personal esteem and sincere regard had been so long and so very generally felt. The meeting also expressed "the high sense universally entertained of his devotion to the duties of his sacred office, his unwearied assiduity in promoting the temporal as well as the spiritual welfare of the poor of the district, and his affectionate kindness to all."

A Subscription, at the same time, was begun, which was limited to a sum not exceeding one guinea to each contributor. With the proceeds of the sum thus collected, to which the pence of the poor no less than the guineas of the rich were alike cheerfully given without solicitation, plate to the value of nearly 200*l.* in a suitable chest, was purchased; and presented, on behalf of the subscribers, with an appropriate address by John Melhuish, Esq. of Walworth House, who had been appointed treasurer to the fund: accompanied by W. K. Cowley, and W. Garland, Esqrs. Churchwardens of St. Peter's Church. The plate was made by Mr. Barton, of Hatton Garden, and is very beautifully chased. It consisted of a complete tea and coffee service; a pair of handsome dishes, with covers; and a 20-inch salver, bearing the following inscription:—

To
THE REV. GEORGE AINSLIE, M.A.
Emmanuel College, Cambridge,
late Minister of St. Peter's District Church, Walworth,
This Testimony
of their sincere esteem and regard
is respectfully presented
by the congregation of that Church, and other inhabitants
of the Parish of St. Mary, Newington,
in the County of Surrey.
December, 1837.

We know not whether we ought to notice, as it was designed only for private distribution, and never published, the farewell sermon of this gentleman, addressed to his affectionate flock on relinquishing his ministry among them. We can only say the sentiments embodied in it, and the whole tone and character of the address, are alike honourable to the preacher, and those whom he addressed. When our Church is assailed on all sides, it is with a feeling of security in the final issue of the contest in favour of the good cause, that we point to such facts as these, as bearing testimony to the blessings resulting from our Parochial Ministry, where the zeal, and love, and labours of the Clergy, are responded to with equal esteem, regard, and affection on the part of those among whom they minister.

REV. M. H. G. BUCKLE.—A beautiful silver inkstand has lately been presented to the Rev. Matthew H. G. Buckle, M.A. late Fellow of Wadham College, and Head Master of the Durham Grammar School, by the King's Scholars under his care.

REV. G. ROUS.—A meeting of the Guardians of the Frome Union, elected in the years 1836 and 1837, was recently held at the Board Room, for the purpose of presenting to the Rev. George Rous, of Laverton, a piece of ornamental plate, as a testimonial of their unanimous approbation of his conduct, as Chairman of the Board, during the two years which have elapsed since the formation of the Union.

REV. J. MENZIES.—The Rev. John Menzies, B.D. Rector of Wyke Regis, near Weymouth, in Dorsetshire (which living has recently been given him by the Bishop of Winchester) has been presented by the parishioners of Farnham, in Surrey, with an elegant silver tea-service, in token of their affectionate esteem and respect, and of the grateful sense they entertain of the exemplary manner in which he has, during a period of more than nine years, discharged the important and arduous duties of assistant curate in that large and populous parish. It is especially gratifying to be able to add, that in addition to the above-mentioned tea-service, a silver goblet was also presented to him by the poor of the parish, who subscribed amongst themselves for that purpose, in order that they might testify, by a present peculiarly their own,

their attachment to their beloved minister, who has been so unwearied in his kind and truly pastoral attention to them.

REV. C. GIRDLESTONE.—A subscription to the amount of 360*l.* has been entered into by the nobility, gentry, and clergy, in the neighbourhood of Sedgley and the surrounding district, for the purpose of presenting a testimonial of respect to the Rev. Charles Girdlestone, on his leaving that parish. A handsome silver urn has been purchased with a small portion (less than one-fourth) of the subscription, and presented to Mr. Girdlestone, and the remainder is intended to be appropriated (at Mr. Girdlestone's request) to the purchase of a site for the new church about to be erected at Upper Gornal, in the parish of Sedgley.

REV. E. J. TODD.—The inhabitants of Axminster have presented their late curate, the Rev. Edward James Todd, with a most elegant tea service, consisting of coffee-pot, tea-pot, sugar-basin and tongs, toast-rack, milk-jug, and cream-ewer, bearing the following inscription:—"Presented to the Rev. E. J. Todd, by the parishioners of Axminster, Devon, in affectionate testimony of his devoted and faithful ministry during a residence among them of twelve years. 1838."

REV. W. R. KEELING.—The congregation of St. Mary's church, Manchester, have presented to their late curate, the Rev. W. R. Keeling, a complete pocket communion service of silver; also a silver cup for domestic uses, and a pair of sugar-tongs. The latter cup contains the following inscription:—"Presented, with a communion service, to the Rev. W. R. Keeling, by the congregation of St. Mary's church, Manchester, as a token of respect. 1838."

REV. J. J. ROGERSON.—The Rev. James Jardine Rogerson, A.M., having resigned the curacy of Christchurch, after performing the sacred duty of his calling for upwards of three years, with extraordinary zeal and ability, in that extensive parish, many of the inhabitants, in order to evince their approbation, and as a token of the high esteem in which they held the Rev. gentleman, entered into a subscription of nearly 40*l.*, with which a piece of plate was purchased, and presented to him in the National School Room, Christchurch, in the presence of the numerous subscribers. An appropriate inscription was engraved on the plate. It was presented by the Rev. W. Douglas Veitch, A.M., accompanied by a most excellent and feeling speech; the Rev. W. Jones, A.M., following in a like address. The Rev. Mr. Rogerson carries with him to his new curacy at Whitechurch, Salop, the sincere and good wishes of the members of the Established Church in the parish of Christchurch.

PLURALITY AND RESIDENCE BILL.

WE have pleasure in laying before our readers a Petition of the Archdeacon and Clergy of Essex, respecting the "Plurality and Residence Bill;" and to which we would direct the attention of the Clergy generally. We also add "A Few Words on the Constitution and Proceedings of the Church Commission," which should be read with attention.

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, in Parliament assembled,

The Petition of the Archdeacon and Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Essex,

Humbly Sheweth, That your Petitioners have seen and carefully considered the Clauses of a Bill, now before your Honourable House, entitled, "A Bill to abridge the holding of Benefices in Plurality, and to make better provision for the Residence of the Clergy." And they beg to assure your Honourable House, that they will never object to any provisions to restrain the holding of Benefices in Plurality which may be framed with a due regard to the constitution of the Church, and a proper provision for the maintenance of the Clergy. And they would willingly assent to any further provision for enforcing the residence of spiritual persons on their benefices, which their ecclesiastical superiors, after due deliberation and mutual conference, may recommend, under the sanction of Parliament, and to any further limitation of the exemptions from such residence which they may deem reasonable and just. But they humbly submit that some of the clauses in the Bill now before your Honourable House seem to them unnecessary for the furtherance of these good ends; and others greatly objectionable, as interposing a new and unconstitutional power between them and their

Diocesans, to whom they have vowed canonical obedience: and by whom they desire to be directed in the discharge of their spiritual functions.

Your Petitioners observe that the former part of Clause 3, which restricts the holders of cathedral preferments, above a certain value, from accepting or taking to hold any benefice above a certain value, is greatly objectionable, as it directly interferes with the patronage of cathedral chapters, and the vested rights of their members. And that the latter part of the clause which prevents the holder of a benefice above a certain value, from taking or holding therewith any cathedral preferment exceeding a certain value, will operate to the destruction of the principle on which all ecclesiastical dignities should be bestowed, by rendering them in future not marks of distinction, or rewards of merit, but mere annexations to benefices of inadequate value; thus creating a species of parochial commendams, at the very time when episcopal commendams are forbidden.

They beg to represent to your Honourable House, that the provision in Clauses 4 and 5, which limit the distance within which two benefices may be held in plurality to ten miles, and forbid any pluralities except where the benefices to be so taken are respectively under a certain value, and contain only a certain population, may well deserve the serious consideration of your Honourable House before they are permitted finally to stand as part of this Bill; it cannot be denied that such a restraint upon pluralities will often prevent those arrangements which are found to be greatly beneficial to small livings, which being held in conjunction with larger and richer preferments, are thus provided with more abundant spiritual instruction and charitable aid, by the increased means afforded to their absent Pastor by his other and better endowed benefice.

Nor are your Petitioners disposed to admit, that pluralities should be even thus far restrained, unless such provision is at the same time made for the employment of Deacons in the Church, as may train them in the duties of their sacred profession, under the eye and control of incumbent Presbyters of sufficient experience, before they are admitted to the office of the Priesthood. And they deprecate, as greatly injurious to the best interests of religion, the continually increasing necessity of investing the younger Clergy with the responsible character of an Incumbent, as soon as they are admitted to the Priest's Office, which the restraining of pluralities in the Church, as it is at present circumstanced, will occasion.

In the opinion of your Petitioners, it is in the inferior, though valuable and honourable, station of Curate, that the practical knowledge of their professional functions, which now so highly distinguishes the officiating Clergy of the Church of England, is always best acquired; and it may be doubted whether an enactment, which directly tends to diminish the numbers, and contract the labours of this very useful class of men, will not be more injurious to the Church than any consequences which have hitherto resulted from pluralities. Your Petitioners are of opinion, that the additional facilities proposed to be given by this Bill to the building of Parsonage Houses, together with an extension of the power of dispensation, now vested in the Crown and exercised through the Archbishop, to all cases of plurality whatsoever, would under fit regulations be sufficient for all practical purposes, and by degrees remove any real evils which pluralities may occasion.

Your Petitioners also observe, by the 11th and nine following Clauses, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England are empowered, upon representation of any one or two Bishops, to recommend to the Queen in Council to unite contiguous benefices in the diocese or dioceses of such Bishops, to make conditions as to residence and employment of Curates on such benefices, and regulations concerning the patronage and episcopal jurisdiction: also to recommend the disunion of united benefices, the apportionment of glebe lands, tithes, modusses, rent charges, and other emoluments between them; the alterations of the boundaries of contiguous parishes, or the separation of Chapels of Ease from the Mother Church, and the uniting of them to some contiguous benefice. And by these clauses it is enacted, that such recommendations, when approved by the Queen in Council, shall have all the force of law in the same manner, and to the same extent, as if they formed part of the provisions of this Act.

Your Petitioners have no objection to offer to the union or disunion of benefices, which may, in their opinion, be in many cases highly useful; but they humbly represent, that the additional and greatly extended power thus given to

a permanent Commission, of whom the majority are laymen, and members of the Council by which these recommendations are to be approved and rendered law, seems to your Petitioners to be incompatible with the constitution of the Church, and derogatory to the dignity, and subversive of the privileges of the Bishops. Your Petitioners do not pretend to an accurate knowledge of the law, nor of the effect which ancient Statutes hitherto considered of vital importance to the constitution, like the Bill of Rights, have or ought to have on subsequent legislation, but they beg to remind your Honourable House, as matter of history, proving the ill working of similar Commissions in former times and the abhorrence in which they were held by the people, that by 16 Car. I. c. 10, 11, such Commissions were said to be abolished for ever; and that by the Bill of Rights, 1 W. & M., all Commissions and Courts of a like nature were declared to be not only pernicious, but illegal. And they respectfully submit, that such powers as may be necessary for the providing for the better pastoral superintendence and spiritual instruction of Her Majesty's subjects may be best entrusted to the Bishops assembled under their Metropolitan, who would be most capable of judging when and how they might be duly and beneficially exercised. And your Petitioners would further suggest, that for this and all other purposes of an ecclesiastical nature, it would greatly promote the discipline and well-being of the Church, if such provincial and diocesan Synods were by law instituted, as are directed to be held Capitibus 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, Tituli de Ecclesiis et Ministris ejus, of that code of Ecclesiastical law proposed in the reign and under the authority of King Edward the Sixth, under the title "*Reformatio legum Ecclesiasticarum*," to which they beg humbly and earnestly to call the attention of your Honourable House.

Your Petitioners observe, that no provision is made by Clause 27, for exempting from residence Fellows of Colleges holding residentiary offices, such as that of Proctor, in either of the Universities, during the time they shall be actually obliged by the duties of their offices to be absent from their benefices. They respectfully suggest, that these offices may be well considered to be a reasonable cause of exemption, as it will sometimes happen, that, in order to provide fit persons to fill responsible situations of this nature, without interfering with the course of education in the University, the Heads of Colleges may find it necessary to summon non-resident Fellows from those poorly endowed benefices which they are permitted to hold with their fellowships.

Your Petitioners also find, that by Clause 29 a difference is made with respect to residence between Clergymen holding a cathedral office or dignity with one benefice, or Clergymen holding two benefices in plurality, by which ten months of actual residence on both their preferments will, in a great many cases, be required of the former; whereas, in all cases, nine months only is required of the latter. Your Petitioners are at a loss to conceive why this provision has been considered necessary: and as it seems to affix a stigma and a penalty upon those of their brethren who have been appointed, or may hereafter be appointed, to situations which have hitherto been considered as marks of distinction and rewards of merit, they humbly trust that this clause will not be allowed to remain as part of the Bill.

Your Petitioners also beg to call the attention of your Honourable House to Clauses 3, 30, and 69, the provisions of which give to this Act a retrospective operation, contrary, as they conceive, to any principle of equitable legislation.

Your Petitioners find this (57 Geo. III.) among the enumerated cases in which a Bishop may now grant licenses for non-residence:—"Any actual illness or bodily infirmity of the wife or child of an Incumbent, making part of, and residing with him, as part of his family." They trust that your Honourable House will not deem it improper to introduce these words, or the substance of them, into Clause 33.

Your Petitioners also represent, that Clause 42, which requires all Incumbents to answer certain queries contained in a schedule, seems to them to require modification; as they cannot believe that your Honourable House will sanction an enactment which compels the Clergy to criminate themselves, and renders their answers to these compulsory queries the evidence on which they may be subjected to the penal clauses of the Act. And they further observe, that they will not only be obliged to answer the queries contained in a schedule, but that other queries may at any time be added to them by Her Majesty in Council; so that it is impossible to say to what extent this inquisitorial examination may be

carried, or to anticipate the consequences to which the Clergy may be subjected by its operation.

Your Petitioners humbly hope that your Honourable House, which has been regarded as the jealous guardian of the rights and liberties of all, even the humblest subjects of the realm, will not place the Clergy under the operations of this clause in its present state.

Your Petitioners request that the term allowed to a non-resident Incumbent to nominate a Curate to the Bishop, in case of the death, resignation, or removal, of any Curate who shall have served his Church or Chapel, may be enlarged to three months at least, as in many cases a shorter period may not be sufficient to make the proper inquiries.

Your Petitioners find it enacted, in Clause 69, that where a benefice exceeds 400*l.* in value, and the population amounts to 2000, the Bishop has power to oblige the Incumbent to nominate a Curate, though he be himself resident and performing the duty. They beg to represent to your Honourable House, that this power is wholly unnecessary, and may be exerted to the great injury and oppression of a resident Incumbent, who feels and knows himself to be capable of performing his own duty, and may be wholly incapable of providing for a Curate out of an income but little perhaps exceeding the regulated sum of 400*l.* They submit that such an enactment would be highly oppressive on the very portion of the Clergy most needing consideration, the ill-endowed Incumbents of town benefices, whose incomes are rarely sufficient to maintain the decent respectability of their station. Nor can they consider the mere fact of there being more than one Church or Chapel in the living a sufficient reason, in any case, for obliging the Incumbent to keep a Curate; nor is it consistent with the provisions of the Bill itself, which expressly empowers a Clergyman to serve two Churches in the same day (see Clause 95.)

Your Petitioners, therefore, humbly pray, that the above clauses may be so altered, amended, or omitted, as to the wisdom of your Honourable House may seem the fittest mode of affording to your Petitioners the relief they crave.

And your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, Tit. de Ecclesiâ et Ministris ejus, Cap. 18.

De Synodis.

"Si contigerit in ecclesiâ gravem aliquando exoriri causam, quæ sine multorum concilio episcoporum haud facile possit finiri, tum Archiepiscopus ad cujus provinciam ea causa pertinet suos episcopos ad provinciale concilium evocabit. Nec eorum quisquam recusabit venire, modo valetudine adversâ non impediatur; quod si morbo gravatus fuerit alium pro se mittat, qui et suam excuset absentiam, et de his quæ tractabuntur pro se respondeat et definiat. Verum concilia hæc provincialia sine nostrâ (Regiâ scilicet) voluntate ac jussu nunquam convocentur."

De Synodo cujuslibet Episcopi in suâ Diocesi, Cap. 19

"Quilibet Episcopus in suâ Diocesi habeat Synodum, in quâ cum suis Presbyteris, parochis, vicariis, et clericis, de his agat rebus quæ pro tempore vel constituenda sunt vel emendanda. Etenim aptissima profecto medicina Synodus est ad castigandam negligentiam, et tollendos errores qui subinde in Ecclesiis per diabolum et malos homines disseminantur, fietque ut per hujusmodi Synodos conjunctio et charitas inter Episcopum et Clericum augeatur et servetur. Nam ille suos Clericos propius cognoscat et alloquetur, atque illi vicissim coram eum audient et quando rei natura postulabit interrogabunt."

N.B.—It is desirable that an opportunity should be given to every Clergyman in the Archdeaconry, whether beneficed or unbeneficed, to sign this Petition.

Signatures by proxy are not admitted by the House of Commons. Each person signing is requested to add to his signature his proper designation.

It is particularly requested that the Petition may be circulated, and returned to the Archdeacon, Stratford Green, with as little delay as possible.

After Easter, the Petition will lie for signatures at Mr. Burder's, 27, Parliament Street, till it is presented.

Stratford Green, Essex, 26th March, 1838.

H. C. J.

A FEW WORDS ON THE CONSTITUTION AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE CHURCH COMMISSION.

THOUGH so much has been said about the Church Commission, yet the ignorance and indifference which prevail as to its nature and proceedings are truly astonishing. It is time that attention should be called to its constitution and working; but before we enlarge upon these heads, it may be worth while to explain what is meant by the Church Commission. In 1834 the late King appointed a commission of thirteen persons—namely, the two archbishops, three bishops and eight laymen (principally the high members of the Cabinet), to inquire into the state of the Church, with reference to ecclesiastical duties and revenues. This commission has recommended great alterations, some of which were made law by a late Act of Parliament, by which a corporate body was erected, called “Ecclesiastical Commissioners,” for the purpose of carrying out the details of some of those alterations. This latter body has been confounded with the *Church Commissioners* before mentioned; there is now, however, this important distinction, that the Church Commission, being by royal appointment, died with King William IV.—the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, being by Act of Parliament, still survive, and to them, being in number the same (indeed the same persons) as the Church Commission, our attention must also be given, because there is a manifest intention shown in the Plurality Bill now before the House of Commons, and in the scheme of the Church Commission for altering the Cathedral Chapters, to invest these Commissioners with great, various, and important authority. In examining, however, into the constitution and proceedings of the Commission, we may drop the distinction, since the one emanates from the other, and they both consist of the same individuals.

In judging of the Church Commission and its proceedings, we may lay down the following rules:—

1. That, except in cases of the clearest necessity, admitting of no doubt, or better remedy, no interference with the rights of any corporation (and this is the lowest definition of the rights of the Clergy) are just without the consent expressed, or implied by want of protest, after ample and clear notice, of those who hold the trust, and those for whose benefit it was erected; such consent being not of a bare majority, but only not much short of unanimous.

2. That the interference shall go no further than is absolutely necessary, to render the trust more generally useful for the purposes for which it was originally designed, and that every alteration shall be as much as possible adapted to existing organization and machinery, even at the sacrifice of some abstract ideas of improvement; thus giving as little excuse as possible by any new systemizing for future and hostile invasions, under the pretext of further improvement.

3. That the greater security and protection of the endowment shall be kept fully in view.

Now the constitution and proceedings of the Church Commission will not be found to be in harmony with any of these principles.

In the first place, no consent of the parties interested in the Church and its endowments has been obtained, or can be implied. The parties are the Clergy, divided into cathedral and parochial; and the Laity. The Laity are not unanimous, and have left the matter very much to the Clergy; the Clergy generally, as far as they have expressed any opinion, are adverse, for there have been many petitions from them against the Commission or its measures, none in support of it, and the Cathedral Clergy are almost unanimously opposed to its proceedings, as well as to its constitution; therefore no alteration, except of a public self-convicting nuisance can be properly made, neither can any authorization of the Commission be implied. But, further, the framing of the Church Commission and of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners (which are other, yet the same) is unconstitutional, and otherwise objectionable. Such an engine is unknown to the spirit of the British constitution; it is not Clerical, it is not Laical;—it has spoken and legislated in one shape, and is intended to legislate in another, for bodies whom it does not adequately represent, and on subjects whereon it had no right to interfere. It cannot be said to represent the Bishops, for they, if not mainly adverse, yet gave it no power to act for them; it cannot speak for the lower Clergy

generally, for they have never been so represented by implication; in these days surely it is an objection which must sound sweetly in some ears, that no *election* has been exercised, and therefore there can be no *representation*. But the constitution of the Board is otherwise objectionable—in a body which is to decide on questions of Church property, Church discipline, and Church expediency, the majority are Laymen, who at best are likely to be very ill informed on Church questions, and may be very ill-affected to the Established Church. True, there is a test of all such Laymen, but what a test? “I do hereby solemnly, and in the presence of God, testify and declare that I am a member of the Church of England:”—there is many a leveller of the Church in the House of Commons who could conscientiously take it. It may be said indeed, that there is a further security, because no Act is valid if two bishops are not present; and that, if there are but two, and they object, the question is put off to the next meeting. Important security! which may be the means of giving a whole week's, or perhaps a month's reprieve to the Church of England from the designs of inimical Lay-Commissioners.

When we apply the second principle to the proceedings of the Commission, we find equally strong objections to them. What shall we say to the extinction of a bishopric, at the very time that the Church is crying out for more bishops? Indeed their alterations are made in contempt of all existing machinery, evidently with a view to generalize as much as possible: for instance, it is proposed to break up all Chapters, which now vary in numbers from three to about fifty stalls, great and small, to give each Cathedral four, and to abolish about one hundred, and carry their incomes to the general stock of the Church Commissioners, to increase small livings; whereas, by giving power to Bishops, Chapters, and others, to attach one or more stalls, according to their value, to poor and populous livings, or rural deaneries, a good approximation to the same general results might be obtained. But what is the effect of the proposition of the Commission? They propose to break up and recast, on a new principle, the whole Cathedral system. Does not this provide a ready excuse for a further grasping and radical change, on the part of any future minister? What shall we say lastly on the third head? So far from providing any better or even equal security for the possessions of the Church, the present plan proposes to pour the whole savings into the common purse of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to tempt any needy government to seize on it for the relief of any State necessity.

Thus much on the general principles which the Church Commission and its offshoots violate.

LIBERALITY OF THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN.—The Bishop of Lincoln has, unsolicited, presented the munificent donation of 800*l.* towards the endowment of a chapel of ease at Holbeach, in his diocese. Such acts as these tell very much against the modern projects of cutting down the bishops' incomes.

EXHIBITIONS AT KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.—Mr. G. F. Daniell, late a student of King's College, London, and son of Professor Daniell, has obtained the exhibition founded in favour of students of that college by the Master and Fellows of Magdalen College, Cambridge; and Mr. H. W. Jones, also a student of King's College, has obtained the Boden Sanscrit Scholarship at Oxford.

RECTORY OF BATH.—We are informed on very good authority, that notwithstanding all the negotiations and other proceedings which have taken place on the subject, the Ven. Archdeacon of Wells does not intend to accept the rectorship of Bath.

NEW CHAPEL AT PORTSMOUTH.—On Wednesday se'nnight, the foundation-stone of an episcopal chapel was laid at Portsmouth. The expenses of building it will be about 3000*l.* The college of Winchester has given 250*l.*; the Bishop of Winchester, 50*l.*, and Mr. C. B. Henville, late Fellow of New College, 250*l.* The following is the inscription on the plate inserted in the stone:—“The foundation-stone of this parochial chapel, dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary, was laid by the Rev. Charles Brune Henville, M.A. Vicar of Portsmouth, on the 21st of March, 1838, in the first year of the reign of her Majesty Victoria.”

VESTRIES IN CHURCHES.—The Bishop of London has presented to the House of Lords a Bill on this important subject; it has been considered and amended in a committee of their Lordships; and the following are the leading features of it, "as amended in committee":—it is entitled, "An Act to prevent the holding of Vestry or other Meetings in Churches."

The preamble sets forth that—"Whereas in parishes where the vestry-room is not sufficiently large and commodious for the holding of vestry or other meetings, not being for the purpose of Divine worship, such meetings are frequently adjourned to, or holden in, the body of the parish church, which practice is productive of scandal to religion, and of other great inconveniences; for remedy thereof be it enacted, &c.

"1. That no meeting, not being for the purpose of Divine worship according to the rites and ceremonies of the United Church of England and Ireland as by law established, or for some religious or ecclesiastical purpose, approved by the bishop of the diocese, shall be holden in the body of any parish church or chapel, or other consecrated church or chapel, nor in the chancel thereof, in any parish or place the population whereof exceeds one thousand persons.

"2. That in any parish or place, the population whereof does not exceed one thousand persons, such meeting as aforesaid shall not be held in the body of the parish church or chapel, or in the chancel thereof, in case the rector, vicar, or other incumbent or minister of the said church or chapel shall forbid the same.

"3. That every vestry or other meeting which by virtue of any statute, law, or custom has heretofore been holden in any vestry-room of any church or chapel of any parish or place, may, from and after the passing of this Act, be holden in such other room within the parish or place as shall be appointed in the notice given of such meeting by the churchwarden or churchwardens, or other persons authorized by law to call the same.

"4. That if any vestry or other meeting be holden in any church or chapel contrary to the provisions of this Act, all proceedings of such meeting shall be absolutely null and void in law.

"5. That this Act shall not extend to that part of the United Kingdom called Scotland."

BODLEIAN LECTURESHIP, EXETER.—The Exeter Church Charity Trustees have elected the Rev. Charles Worth, B.A. of Queen's College, to the Bodleian Lecture-ship in Exeter, for the ensuing year.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF MARYLAND, U. S.—On the 25th of February, at his residence, near Salisbury, Somerset county, U.S., died the Right Rev. William Murray Stone, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Maryland.

REGISTRAR OF LONDON UNIVERSITY.—Mr. Rothman, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, has been elected Registrar to the Senate of the London University. The appointment is a good one, with a salary of 600*l.* a-year.

ANCIENT MANUSCRIPT OF THE GOSPELS.—The Rev. J. H. Todd gave lately to the Royal Irish Academy a short account of a Manuscript of the Four Gospels, of the seventh century, and in Irish characters, which is preserved in the library of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, at Lambeth. The volume is a small quarto, in the minute hand called *Caroline*, common to all Europe in the reign of Charlemagne, but now used only in Ireland, and known as the Irish character. The present volume appears to have belonged to Maelbrigd Mac Dornan, or Mac Tornan, who was Archbishop of Armagh in the ninth century, and died A.D. 925. By him it was probably sent to Athelstan, king of the Anglo-Saxons, who presented it to the city of Canterbury. These facts are inferred from an inscription in Anglo-Saxon characters (and in a hand of the ninth, or beginning of the tenth century), which occurs on a blank page immediately following the genealogy in the first chapter of St. Matthew. The discovery of this manuscript, and the satisfactory proof which facts afford of its Irish origin, are important, as adding another to the many instances with which we are already acquainted, of the employment of Irish scribes in the transcriptions of the Scriptures during the sixth and seventh centuries. It is now well ascertained that almost all the sacred books so highly venerated by the Anglo-

Saxon Church, and left by her early bishops as heir-looms to their respective sees, were obtained by Ireland or Irish scribes.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.—At the meeting of this Society, Mr. Tyler's motion has been carried, by 148 to 66, that no member should report the proceedings which took place in the Committee Room. The object of this resolution is, to stop Mr. Clark, a guinea subscriber, from inserting what passes in the *Record* newspaper, for party purposes.

ORGANIST AT ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.—Mr. Goss, organist at Chelsea New Church, was, on the 26th ult., elected organist at St. Paul's Cathedral, in the place of Mr. Thomas Attwood, deceased.

WICK-HILL.—The monumental pillar on Wick-hill, in Brenhill, erected at the joint expense of the Marquis of Lansdowne and the Rev. Canon Bowles, M.A. of Trinity College, has just been completed, and the figure, in the costume of Edward IV., was elevated to the top of the monument; a large concourse of the inhabitants of the neighbouring parishes being present at the ceremony. A good band of music was on the ground, and Wick-hill presented the appearance of the scene of a holiday fête.

YORK CATHEDRAL LIBRARY.—Any gentlemen resident in York, or the suburbs, may have the loan of books from the library, by leave from the Dean or the Residentiary; but application may be made to them through the Librarian, who fulfils the intentions of his superiors in affording every possible facility of access to their valuable collection of theological and other works. The number of volumes in the library amounts to nearly 8,000—a considerable part of them having been bequests and gifts, to be for ever attached to the Cathedral. The collection consists chiefly of works which were published before, or at the beginning of, the last century; and contains authors in the various departments of literature—only about half the volumes being theological. There is a good collection of the Classics, and the Fathers of the Christian Church, most of them in the best editions; with some valuable works on rabbinical learning, ecclesiastical and general history, and antiquities; the principal of the ancient authors *de re medica*, and some good specimens of manuscripts, and early printed books. A very considerable portion of the works is in the learned or modern foreign languages. The Librarian's ordinary days of attendance at the library are Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, at twelve o'clock.

RATING TITHE RENT-CHARGE.—The following correspondence, which contains the rule on which the Poor-Law Commissioners consider the Tithe-Commutation rent-charge ought to be rated under the New Assessment Act, will be found useful to our agricultural readers:—

"Gentlemen,—I have seen a paragraph in various newspapers represented to be the opinion of the Poor-Law Commissioners respecting the rating the Tithe-Commutation rent-charge under the Parochial Assessment Act: in the paragraph above referred to, it is stated that the assessment for the tithe ought not to be on the full rent-charge, but on the net annual value of such rent-charge after deductions made for parochial rates. Under these circumstances, I trouble you for your opinion in the following case:—

"The landowners of this parish have entered into an agreement for the Commutation of the Tithes, by which agreement they give 500*l.* by way of rentage in lieu of tithes; 400*l.* of which sum is the annual average amount of composition actually paid for the seven years ending Christmas 1835, and 100*l.* is one-fifth of the annual average amount of poor and other rates, for the like period. In consequence of the introduction of the Poor-Law Amendment Act, one-fifth of the annual average amount of poor and other rates for the year ending Christmas 1837, is 50*l.*; therefore the opinion I wish to obtain is, what proportion of the 500*l.* (the full rent-charge,) should be deducted for parochial rates.

"I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

A. G. W."

"Poor-Law Commission Office, Somerset House.

"**SIR**.—The Poor Law Commissioners for England and Wales have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 26th ult., and having had under consideration the case on which you request their opinion, they desire to state, that in determining the amount at which the rent-charge for which the tithes of a parish have been commuted should be assessed, it appears to them that the estimate of the rates and taxes to be deducted, should be made on the basis of the year immediately preceding, that being the best mode for judging of what they will be in the next year.

"It would not be proper to estimate the amount to be deducted by reference to any expectations of an increase or decrease of rates founded on mere opinion, such as the expectation that the operation of the Poor-Law Amendment Act will, during the course of next year, reduce the rates below the amount of the preceding year; for on this opinions may very reasonably differ, while the amount of the rates of the preceding year is certain, and if applied to all property in the parish can do injustice to none.

"Signed by order of the Board, "E. CHADWICK,
"Mr. A. G. W." "Secretary."

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS.—At her Majesty's Levee, the Archdeacon of Winchester presented an Address from the Archdeacon and Clergy of the Archdeaconry, praying her Majesty to stay the proceedings of the ecclesiastical commissioners for England until the sense of the Church at large shall have been expressed. Signed per 235 names.

CLERICAL INVESTMENTS.—Mr. Rice's Bill, permitting Clergymen to make investments in joint-stock societies, is not merely necessary to the protection of such societies, it is due to the ministers of religion to place them on a footing of equality with their fellow subjects in providing for their families, when it can be done in a mode not calculated to interrupt the discharge of their sacred duties. At present a Clergyman can make such provision only by investing money in public securities, which yield but a slender rate of interest, or by investment in land, which is still less profitable, as well as being more hazardous, or by a life insurance, a barren sacrifice until his death. There can be no good reason assigned for this restriction. The reason of the law forbidding secular occupations to the Clergy cannot apply to a case where there is no pursuit whatever to occupy a man's time, or his care; and "*cessante ratione cessat et lex*," common sense would say, if the text of the law and the Court of Exchequer had not pronounced a different judgment. Mr. Rice's Bill is merely a measure to reconcile law with common sense in this particular, and we trust that it will meet with no obstruction.

ORDINATIONS.—1838.

By the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells.

DEACONS.

Name.	Degree.	College.	University.
Beames, Thomas	B.A.	Lincoln	Oxford
Bewsher, C.W.	B.A.	St. Peter's	Cambridge
Broderip, John Somerville	B.A.	Balliol	Oxford
Cartwright, George Leopold	B.A.	Exeter	Oxford
Caswall, Edward	B.A.	Brasenose	Oxford
Crouch, William	B.A.	Exeter	Oxford
Dusantoy, W.	B.A.	Sidney Sussex	Cambridge
King, Thomas Edmund		St. John's	Cambridge
Lapfeare, W. F.		Queen's	Cambridge
Lawrence, C. S.	(<i>let. dim.</i>) Lit.		
Onslow, C.	B.A.	Trinity	Cambridge
Roberts, George		Magdalen Hall	Oxford
Scrivener, F. H. A.	B.A.	Trinity	Cambridge
Tyler, George Dacre Alexander	M.A.	Trinity	Oxford
Webber, J.	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge

PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Degree.</i>	<i>College.</i>	<i>University.</i>
Bishop, W. C. (<i>let. dim.</i>)	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge
Browne, Thomas Clements	M.A.	Magdalen Hall	Oxford
Carrow, H.	B.A.	Trinity	Cambridge
Floud, Thomas	M.A.	Wadham	Oxford
Goodhall, W.	B.A.	Catharine Hall	Cambridge
Grey, Harry	B.A.	St. Edmund Hall	Oxford
Mordaunt, Charles	B.A.	New Inn Hall	Oxford
Peake, George Eden	M.A.	Magdalen Hall	Oxford
Saline, J.	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge
Tuson, F. E.	B.A.	St. John's	Cambridge

PREFERMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>Net Value.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Andrews, R.	Spaldwick	84	Hunts	Lincoln	Preb. in Linc. Cath.
Beadon, H. W.	Latton with Eisey	380	Wilts	Salisb.	Earl of St. Germans
Bloxsome, W. H.	{ Stanton cum Snows- hill	377	{ Gloster	G. & B.	E. Bloxsome, Esq.
Bond, J. T.	Freston	369	Suffolk	Norw.	{ Rev. G. Capper Rev. T. Mann
Bransby, W. B.	Charsfield	66	Suffolk	Norw.	Earl Howe
Chapman, W. H.	Balsham	1104	Camb.	Ely	{ Governors of Char- ter House
Close, J.	Kirkby Ravenswth.	104	York	Chester	Bishop of Chester
Cole, W. G.	Walpole	82	Suffolk	Norw.	{ Archdn. of Sodor & Man
Colf, C.	Shadoxhurst	177	Kent	Canterb.	Lord Chancellor
Coope, W. J.	Falmouth	668	Cornwall	Exeter	Lord Wodehouse
Coulcher, G.	St. Benedict, Camb.	151	Camb.	Ely	Corpus Christi
Denison, G. A.	Broad Windsor	558	Dorset	G. & B.	Bishop of Salisbury
Dolligon, J.	Hilborough	390	Norfolk	Norw.	Own petition
Dryden, L. G. G.	Ambrosden	228	Oxford	Oxford	{ Trustees of Sir G. P. Turner
Earle, E. R.	Wardley with Belton	287	Rutland	Peterb.	The Queen
Edmundson, G.	{ Immanuel Church, Fenis-cowles		{ Lancaster	Chester	Dr. Whittaker
Evans, R.	Wherwell	301	Hants	Winchest.	Preb. of Wherwell
Fitzroy, T. W. C.	Ringstead		Norfolk	Norw.	H. L. Styleman, Esq.
Foster, I.	{ Winterbourne, Monkton	157	{ Dorset	Bristol	Earl of Ilchester
Gambier, F.	Barford St. Martin	798	Wilts	Salisb.	All Souls' College
Gane, W.	{ Shaston St. Rumbold, alias Cann	196	{ Dorset	G. & B.	Earl of Shaftesbury
Gaselee, J.	Little Yeldham	222	Essex	London	Lord Chancellor
Gasborne	Croxall	489	Derby	L. & C.	Lord Chancellor
Green, E. T.	Orleton	156	Hereford	Hereford	Govs. Lucton Sch.
Hunt, C. A.	St. Peter's, Blackburn	153	Lancaster	Chester	Vicar of Blackburn
Hutton, W.	Warton	187	Lancaster	Chester	D. & Ch. of Worc.
Johnston, W. D.	Ifield	120	Kent	P. of Cant.	W. Edmeads, Esq.
Jones, D.	Panteague	351	Monm.	Llandaff	C. H. Leigh, Esq.
Litchfield, F.	Farthinghoe		Northam.	Peterb.	E. of Wilton
Lyon, W.	{ St. George, Little Bolton	168	{ Lancaster	Chester	Trustees
M'Conkey, J.	All Saints, Liverpool		Lancaster	Liverpool	Trustees
Newby, G.	Borrowdale	62	Cumb.	Carlisle	Rev. J. Lynn
Poole, T.	Firbeck with Letwell	122	Yorkshire	York	Chan. of Ch. York
Powell, W.	Llanhenoch	64	Monm.	Llandaff	Ch. of Llandaff
Raine, W.	Swinbrook	57	Oxford	Oxford	Ch. of Salisb. Cath.
Read, F.	{ St. Margaret's Chap., Brighton	150	{ Sussex	Chiches.	Prop. of Chapel

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>Net Value.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Robinson, C. W.	Prestwold and Hoton	24	Leicester	Lincoln	C. W. Packe, Esq.
Scott, J. . . .	Uppington	70	Salop	Hereford	Duke of Cleveland
Stone	St. Thomas at Radcliffe	100	Lancaster	Chester	Rector of Radcliffe
Talbot, Hon. and Rev. W. W. C.	Ombersley	417	Worces.	Worces.	Lord Sandys
Tate, J. . . .	Easby	92	York	Chester	The Queen
Tracy, E. . . .	Sully	250	Glamorg.	Llandaff	Mrs. Thomas
Turner, S. B. .	Linstead Magna	97	Suffolk	Norw.	Lord Huntingfield
Tyrwhitt, J. B.	Claxby Pluckacre	70	Lincoln.	Lincoln	H. Dymoke, Esq.
Vaughan, H. .	Llansaintfraed in Elvel	171	Radnor	St. Dav.	Bishop of St. Dav.
Wetherall, J. .	Rushton, All Saints	674	Northam.	Peterbo.	W. W. Hope, Esq.
Whicheote, C. .	St. Michael's in Stamford	136	Lincoln	Lincoln	Marquis of Exeter
Yonge, W. . . .	Necton and Holm Hale	1122	Norfolk	Norw.	Bishop of Norwich
Yorke, P. W. .	Rayleigh	778	Essex	London	R. Bristowe, Esq.

CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Preferment.</i>	<i>Net Value.</i>	<i>County.</i>	<i>Diocese.</i>	<i>Patron.</i>
Barnes, J. . . .	Warton	187	Lancaster	Chester	D. & C. of Worcest.
Buxton, T. . . .	Kirkby Ravensworth	104	York	Chester	Bp. of Chester.
Cooke, C. . . .	Semer	385	Suffolk	Norwich	Rev. C. Cooke.
Dowland, J. J. G.	Broad Windsor	558	Dorset	G. & B.	Bp. of Salisb.
Dreyer, R. . . .	Thwaite	143	Norfolk	Norwich	Duke of Norfolk.
Dunkin, W. . . .	Pilham	200	Lincoln	Lincoln	Lord Chancellor.
Edgecombe, J. .	Thornbury	198	Devon	Exeter	Mrs. Spencer.
George, R. . . .	Wolverly	250	Worcest.	Worst.	D. & C. of Worcest.
	Stoke Prior	270	Worcest.	Worst.	
Gray, R. . . .	Little Yeldham	222	Essex	London	Lord Chancellor.
Hooker, Dr. . .	Rottingdean	332	Sussex	Chichester.	
Leyson, L. . . .	Pantegue	351	Monm.	Llandaff	C. H. Leigh, Esq.
Milward, E. . .	Farthinghoe		Northam.	Peterb.	Earl of Wilton.
Mitford, J. R. .	Manaccan	193	Cornwall	Exeter	Bp. of Exeter.
North, H. . . .	Ringstead		Norfolk	Norwich	H. L. Styleman, Esq.
Parkinson P. . .	St. Thomas at Radcliffe	100	Lancaster	Chester	Rector of Radcliffe.
Porter, R. . . .	Draycott	452	Stafford	L. & C.	Dowag. L. Stourton.
Prescott, C. . .	Downton and Burrington	146 146	Hereford	Hereford	Lord Chancellor.
	Great Stambridge	600	Essex	London	Gov. of Charterh.
Ramsden, W. B.	Little Wakering	190	Essex	London	St. Barthol. Hosp.
	Croxton	98	Norfolk	Norwich	Christ Coll. Camb.
Rideout	Woodmancote	369	Sussex	Chichester.	Lord Chancellor.
Saunders, G. . .	Wollaton	792	Notting.	York	Lord Middleton.
Shipton, Dr. . .	Portishead	729	Somerset	B. & W.	Corp. of Bristol.
	Stanton Bury	54	Bucks	Lincoln	Earl Spencer.
Socket, T. . . .	Ombersley	417	Worcest.	Worcest.	Lord Sandys.
Thompson, E. . .	Aspatria	249	Cumb.	Carlisle	Bp. of Carlisle.
Tucker, W. C. .	Washford Pyne	144	Devon	Exeter	W. Comyns, Esq.
Wasey, G. . . .	Ulcomb	379	Kent	Canter.	Hon. C. B. Wandesford.
Wetherall, J. L.	Rushton, All Saints	674	Northamp.	Peterb.	W. W. Hope, Esq.
Wiglesworth, H.	Slaidburn	336	York	York	

APPOINTMENTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Appointment.</i>
Baxter, T.	Under Mastership of Grammar School, Worcester.
Bowen, C.	Domestic Chaplain to Lord Bateman.
Cooper, J.	Chaplain to H.M.S. the Malabar.
Davis, E.	Curacy of Clodock, Herefordshire.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Appointment.</i>
Chesshyre, W. J.	Curacy of St. John's, Worcester.
Duffield, M. D.	Domestic Chaplain to H. R. H. Duke of Cambridge.
Eteson, R.	Chaplaincy at Chumar.
Foster, J.	Domestic Chaplain to Earl of Eldon.
Fox, O.	Head Mastership of Grammar School, Worcester.
Garnett, R.	Sub-Librarian in British Museum.
Johnson, J.	Chaplain to H. R. H. Duke of Cambridge.
Keymer, N.	Head Mastership of Christ's Hospital, Hertford.
Llewellyn, R. P.	Head Mastership of Grammar School, Chester.
Manisty, J.	Domestic Chaplain to Earl of Eldon.
Marshall, W. K.	Chaplain to High Sheriff for Shropshire.
Mossop, S.	Domestic Chaplain to Earl of Dunmore.
Richards, H.	Domestic Chaplain to Duke of Argyle.
Scott, J.	Mastership of Grammar School, Donnington.
Topham, J.	Chaplain to Droitwich Union.
Young, J.	{ Head Mastership of Grammar School, Houghton-le-Spring, Durham.

OBITUARY.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Appointment or Residence.</i>
Anderton, W.	Northowram, near Halifax.
Buck, J.	Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
Elston, W.	Curate of Naxton and Levington.
Evans, W.	Upton Castle, near Pembroke.
Fookes, W.	Cornwall.
Garnier, J.	Fellow of Merton College, Oxford.
Hinde, —	Head Mastership of Ludlow Free Grammar School.
Ifill, J. S.	At Rome.
Johnstone, C. J.	Fellow of Cains College, Cambridge.
Marshman, Dr.	Serampore, East Indies.
Simonds, G. T.	At Dorchester.
Stock, E. P.	Chaplain to Bradford Union.
Todd, J.	Curate of Frankley, Worcestershire.
Vawdrey, W.	Curate of Gwinear, Cornwall.
Wheeler, G.	Curate of Shipton le Moyne, Gloucestershire.
Wilkinson, H.	Head Mastership of Grammar School, Sedbergh.

OXFORD.

Congregations will be holden for the purpose of granting Graces and conferring Degrees on the following days in the present Term, viz.—

Thursday, May 3 | Thursday, May 17
Thursday, May 10 | Friday . May 25
Saturday, June 2

No person will, on any account, be admitted as a candidate for the degree of B.A. or M.A. or for those of B.C.L. or B.M. (without proceeding through Arts), whose name is not entered in the book, kept for that purpose, at the Vice-Chancellor's house, on or before the day preceding the day of congregation.

DEGREES CONFERRED.

BACHELOR IN DIVINITY.

Rev. C. Abel Heurtley, Fellow of C.C.C.

BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW.

Robert Jackson, Fellow of New Coll.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

Rev. J. A. Harvey, St. Edmund Hall.
Rev. E. J. Carter, Exeter Coll.
Rev. J. Overton, Magdalen Hall.
Rev. A. C. Tarbutt, Fell. of Wadham Coll.
A. F. Foster, Trinity Coll.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

J. J. Randolph, Student of Christ Ch.
Lord Viscount Emlyn, Christ Ch.
J. P. Severn, Christ Ch.
T. R. Agnew, Fell. of New Coll.
J. H. Wardroper, Exeter Coll.
W. Winchester, Commoner of Christ Church.

The nomination of the Rev. Joseph Walker, M.A. Fellow of Brasen-nose College, to be a Public Examiner in *Disciplinis Mathematicis et Physicis*, has been unanimously approved.

The Examiners appointed to select a Scholar on the foundation established for the better cultivation of the Latin language, have signified to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor their election of Mr. F. H. M. Blaydes, Commoner of Christ Church, to the vacant Scholarship.

The Examiners appointed by the Trustees of the Lusby Scholarship have elected Mr. W. Henry Chepmell, of Magdalen Hall, to the vacant Scholarship on that Foundation.

BRASENNOSE COLLEGE.

Mr. R. J. Butler has been elected to the

Aynhoe School Scholarship at Brasen-nose College.

LINCOLN COLLEGE.

Mr. John Charles Sale, Commoner of Lincoln College, has been elected a Scholar of that Society; and Mr. J. Leopold Longmire, a Commoner of Worcester College, has been elected one of Lord Crewe's Exhibitioners of Lincoln College.

ORIEL COLLEGE.

Mr. James C. Prichard, B.A. Scholar of Trinity College, and Mr. Richard W. Church, B.A. of Wadham College, have been elected Fellows of Oriel College.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE.

Mr. Henry Highton, B.A. has been elected and admitted Scholar on the Michel Foundation of Queen's College.

CAMBRIDGE.

The Chancellor's medals for the two best proficient in Classical learning among the commencing Bachelors of Arts, have been adjudged to Lord Lyttelton and Dr. C. J. Vaughan, both of Trinity College, but without determining the order of the candidates; and at an additional meeting of the Examiners, those gentlemen were declared to be equal.

Bell's Scholarships.—The following are the names of the gentlemen who have been elected Scholars on the above Foundation:—

Æq. { Ellicott, St. John's College,
Robinson, Trinity College.

Norrisian Prize.—The Norrisian Prize has been adjudged to Mr. Daniel Moore, of Catharine Hall, for his Essay on the following subject:—

"The state of the Christian Religion from its promulgation to the present time not inconsistent with the belief that it is a Revelation from God."

DEGREES CONFERRED.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

C. F. Partridge, Trinity Coll.
J. May, Trinity Coll.
C. Evans, St. John's Coll.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

D. Calliphronas, Trinity Coll.
T. M. Nicholson, Trinity Coll.
T. Livesey, Trinity Coll.
E. C. Terot, Trinity Coll.

C. Baldock, St. John's Coll.
E. Baylis, St. John's Coll.
C. Grain, Pembroke Coll.
W. Bond, Caius Coll.
G. R. Medley, Corpus Christi Coll.
W. Price, Corpus Christi Coll.
T. M. Wythe, Queen's Coll.
R. R. Ford, Queen's Coll.
R. P. Waller, Jesus Coll.
W. Walsh, St. John's Coll.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE.

The following gentlemen have been elected Fellows of St. John's College:—

Dr. Collison	Dr. Brumell
Lane	Main
Chapman	

KING'S COLLEGE.

George Goldney, Scholar of King's College, has been elected a Fellow of that society.

MAGDALEN COLLEGE.

George Augustus Chichester May, B.A. and William Wellington Willock, B.A. of Magdalen College, have been elected Fellows of that society.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE.

Osborne Reynolds, Esq. B.A. of Queen's College, has been elected a Foundation Fellow of that Society.

Meetings of the Philosophical Society for the Easter Term:—Monday, May 14; and Monday, May 28.

MARRIAGES.

At Upham, Hants, the Rev. Francis John Eyre (third son of the late George Eyre, Esq., of the Warrens, Hants), to Ann Louisa, second daughter of the Rev. John Haygarth, Rector of Upham.

At Leamington, the Rev. Joshua King, M.A. late Fellow of Brasenose College, Rector of St. Matthew, Bethnal Green, Middlesex, and of Woodchurch, Cheshire, to Hamilton Georgiana, youngest daughter of the late Rev. Thomas Aveling, Rector of Millbrooke, Bedfordshire.

At Weymouth, the Rev. George Caesar Hawkins, B.A. of Oriel College, Vicar of Pinhoe, Devon, to Eleanor, eldest daughter of George Villiers Villiers, Esq., late of the Royal Horse Guards.

At Saint Benedict's, Cambridge, by the Rev. T. B. Stuart, Fellow of Queen's College, the Rev. James Nelson, of Luddenhams, in the parish of Halifax, to Jane, youngest daughter of the late Thomas Hall, Esq., of Saffron Walden, Essex.

At St. Cuthbert's, Wells, the Rev. F. Fleming Beadon, M.A. of Oriel College, Vicar of Pilton, Somerset, only son of the Rev. Canon Beadon, of Stoneham, Hants, to Augusta, daughter of the late J. P. Tudway, Esq., M.P. for Wells.

At Marcham, by the Rev. Benjamin Morland, the Rev. Henry Wm. Bowles Daubeney, of Cainscross, Gloucestershire, son of Col. Daubeney, of Bath, to Peggy Louisa, fourth daughter of the late Benjamin Morland, Esq., of Sheepstead-house, near Abingdon.

BIRTHS.

In Beaumont-street, Oxford, the lady of the Rev. Richard Grueswell, of Worcester College, of a daughter.

At the house of her father, Robert Williams, Esq. of Grosvenor Square, London, the lady of Arthur Henry Dyke Acland, Esq. M.A. of Christ Church, of a daughter.

At Fulham, the lady of the Rev. Evan Nepean, of a daughter.

The lady of the Rev. H. C. Brice, Rector of St. Peter's, Bristol, of a son.

At Cheltenham, the lady of the Rev. Henry Griffiths, of a daughter.

At the Vicarage, Colebrook, Devonshire, the lady of the Rev. Arthur Grueber, of twins, a son and daughter. This is the second time this lady has had twins; the former, two boys.

At Colchester, the lady of the Rev. W. H. Graham, of a daughter.

At the Vicarage, Beverley, Yorkshire, the lady of the Rev. W. T. Sandys, of a son.

At the Rectory, Freckenham, Suffolk, the lady of the Rev. George B. Paley, of a son.

At Mapperton-house, near Beaminstor, the lady of the Rev. William Maskell, of a daughter.

At Stepney, Barbadoes, the lady of the Ven. Archdeacon Parry, of a son.

At Catton, the lady of the Rev. Dacre Barrett Lennard, of a daughter.

At Collumpton School, the lady of the Rev. W. F. Good, of a son.

At Burghfield Rectory, Berks, the lady of the Rev. H. C. Cherry, of a daughter.

The lady of the Rev. H. Pountney, of a son.

In Achill, the lady of the Rev. Joseph Baylee, of a daughter.

At the Glebe-house, Binsted, the lady of the Rev. Samuel J. Lockhart, of a daughter.

At the Vicarage, Barton Stacey, Hants, the lady of the Rev. David Jackson, of a son.

The lady of the Rev. W. S. Robinson, Rector of Dyrham, Gloucestershire, of a daughter.

The lady of the Rev. Dr. Moberly, late Fellow of Balliol College, Head Master of Winchester School, of a daughter.

The lady of the Rev. W. W. Malet, late of Magdalene Hall, of a daughter, still-born.

At South Newton, Wilts, the lady of the Rev. G. Pugh, of a son.

At Handley, Dorset, the lady of the Rev. T. Mason, of a daughter.

The lady of the Rev. J. E. Shadwell, Rector of All Saints, Southampton, of a son.

At the Rectory, Meshaw, Devon, the lady of the Rev. W. H. Karslake, late of Oriel College, of a daughter.

At Deene, the lady of the Rev. John Daniel, of a son.

The lady of the Rev. Arthur Fane, of a daughter.

At Great Gransden Vicarage, the lady of the Rev. T. A. Grice, of a son.

At the Vicarage, East Grinstead, Sussex, the lady of the Rev. C. Neville, of a daughter.

At Bondshill, near Dublin, the lady of the Rev. J. S. Monsell, of a daughter.

At the house of her father, G. Bennett, Esq. Merrion-square, Dublin, the lady of the Rev. Delves Broughton, of a daughter.

At the Rectory, Boughton, the lady of the Rev. Claudius Sandys, of a daughter.

At Horley Vicarage, the lady of the Rev. C. Thompson, of a daughter.

At Woodville, Kildare, the lady of the Rev. W. J. Aylmer, Curate of Donadee, of a daughter.